

LABOR FACT BOOK

15

PREPARED BY

Labor Research Association

\$2.25

LABOR FACT BOOK 15

**ANSWERS YOUR QUESTIONS ON
A THOUSAND TOPICS**

•

A LABOR-WORLD ALMANAC

•

FACTS AND FIGURES ON U.S.

•

ECONOMIC TRENDS

•

SOCIAL & LABOR CONDITIONS

•

HEALTH AND MEDICAL CARE

•

CIVIL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES

•

TRADE UNIONS

•

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

•

CANADIAN LABOR DEVELOPMENTS

For 30 years the only non-government arsenal of facts—frankly pro-labor and based on standard government, business and labor sources.

Prepared and edited by the oldest organization of its kind in America —

LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Special Features of Previous Volumes, Still Available

In Addition to Contents Similar to Those in Volume 15

Labor Fact Book 14: Housing Conditions; Progress in Integration; Farm Population Trends; Anti-Labor Laws; Un-American Committee's Witch-hunt; Negroes in Public Office.

Labor Fact Book 13: New Fringe Benefits; Concentration in Agriculture; School Integration Problems; AFL-CIO Merger; Morton Sobell Frame-Up; Record of 84th Congress.

Labor Fact Book 12: Labor and Automation; Juvenile Delinquency; Mental Illness; Tax Loopholes; Schools in Crisis; McCarthyism in Action.

Labor Fact Book 11: Cold War Budget; Eisenhower's Farm Program; Big Money in the Elections; Taft-Hartley; Blacklisting in Radio, TV and Screen.

Labor Fact Book 10: The Marshall Plan; War Taxes; Fascist Violence in Peekskill; Expulsions from the CIO; Organized Labor in the Elections.

Labor Fact Book 9: Merger Movement; Oil Imperialism in Middle East; Attacks on Academic Freedom; Progressive Party.

Labor Fact Book 8: Conditions of the Negro People (Chapter); Newspaper Monopoly; CIO Report on Soviet Labor.

Labor Fact Book 6: Concentration of War Contracts; High Salaries of Corporate Executives; Unions in World War II.

Labor Fact Book 5: Spain under Franco; Facts about the FBI; Anti-Labor Tactics.

\$2.25 each volume

LABOR FACT BOOK 15

PREPARED BY
LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION



INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 31-20156

© 1961, by International Publishers Co., Inc.



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NOTE

The present volume like its 14 predecessors since 1931 contains data relating mainly to the previous two years. However, some facts and figures present comparisons with earlier periods; others cover developments in the early months of 1961.

Although the chapters are in general the same as in previous *Labor Fact Books*, we have this time omitted the usual one on agriculture (discussed briefly in Chapter I) and included instead a full chapter on health problems of the American people. For the second time we have devoted an entire chapter to a review of Canadian labor developments.

Sources of much of the material are not given because of lack of space. The data are largely from standard government, business and labor publications; we are always glad to supply readers with the exact source for any specific fact. Use of cross references has been held to a minimum in view of the full index on pages 161-168. Also the names of unions and other organizations have been frequently abbreviated as in our previous volumes.

We are indebted to many unions, organizations and persons for helping with material or for checking prepared copy. We are especially indebted to Attorney Blanch Freedman of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born for the section on the rights of noncitizens.

Labor Research Association
80 East 11th Street
New York City 3, N. Y.

May, 1961

CONTENTS

I. ECONOMIC TRENDS

7

Expansion and Slump, 7; Fewer Farmers, More Crops, 11; Corporate Profits and Dividends, 12; U.S. Budget for War, 14; Federal Tax Burden, 16; Gold and the Balance of Payments, 17.

II. SOCIAL AND LABOR CONDITIONS

19

Distribution of Income, 19; Real Wages and Wage Differentials, 22; Wage Gains in Union Contracts, 25; Family Budgets, 26; Hours of Work, 28; Effects of Automation 30; Work Injuries and Deaths 33; Social Security Changes, 34; Extent of Unemployment, 37; Unemployment Insurance, 39; Depressed Areas, 42; Poverty in "Affluent" America, 45; Economic Situation of Negro Workers, 48; Puerto Ricans in the U.S., 50; Women Workers, 51; School System Shortages, 53; Housing Conditions, 55.

III. PEOPLE'S HEALTH

57

Killers and Diseases, 57; Poisons in Food and Air, 59; Rising Costs of Medical Care, 62; Price Gouging in Drugs, 65; Medical Manpower Shortages, 68; Hospital Facilities, 69; Medical Needs of the Aging, 70; Because of Race or Color, 72; Mental Illness 73; Increase in Alcoholism, 75; National Health Service Proposals, 76.

IV. U.S. TRADE UNIONS

78

Third Convention of AFL-CIO, 79; Co-Existence Policies and Union Delegations, 85; Discrimination Against Negroes, 68; Negro American Labor Council, 89; Increases in White-Collar Workers, 89; Women in Unions, 91; West Coast Longshoremen's Agreement, 92; Strikes in 1959, 93; Hard Fought Strikes in 1960, 96; Landrum-Griffin and Taft-Hartley, 98.

V. CIVIL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS

102

In Defense of the First Amendment, 192; Un-American Committee Exposed, 106; McCarran Act Appeal, 108; Taft-Hartley Persecutions, 109; Smith Act Membership Clause 110; Cruel Treatment of Winston, 111; Sobel Appeal, 111; Rights of Noncitizens, 112; Dismissal of Teachers, 116; Loyalty Oaths, 117; Civil Rights Act of 1960, 118; Negro Sit-In Demonstrations, 119; Integration in Schools, 122; Negroes' Voting Rights, 126.

VI. POLITICAL AFFAIRS

130

The Eighty-Sixth Congress, 130; Election of Kennedy, 134; Negroes Support Kennedy, 135; The Republican Press, 136; State Governors, 136; Changes in Congress, 137; Minority Parties and Candidates, 141; Votes and Voting Restrictions, 146; Unequal Representation, 147; Campaign Costs and Expenditures, 148; No Curb on Filibuster, 150; Congressional Committee Changes in 1961, 150.

VII. CANADIAN LABOR DEVELOPMENTS

152

Economic Trends, 152; Labor and Social Conditions, 153; Canadian Trade Unions, 155; Collective Bargaining Difficulties, 157; Legislative and Political Action, 158; Canadian-United States and World Relations, 159.

INDEX

161

I. ECONOMIC TRENDS

EXPANSION AND SLUMP

The recession of 1960-61 started in May although most aggregate measures of the economy held stable for a while after that month. The decline was sharper in the autumn and winter and by February 1961 industrial output had fallen 8% below its peak in the spring of 1960. Full-time unemployment was officially estimated as around 5.7 million.

As this is written the latest recession, the third in 7 years and the fourth since World War II, is regarded by business economists as "relatively moderate." However, as the *Monthly Review* of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis noted (Feb. 1961), "it appears that the current recession may be as severe as the two preceding ones when compared with full utilization of the country's resources, since this recession started with economic activity at a lower level relative to capacity."

From the point of view of the jobless, with at least one out of 12 in the labor force officially estimated out of work, this recession was definitely the worst since World War II. With unemployment at a 20-year high for the month in March 1961 it was a major symptom of the "chronic slack in the economy" which constituted the major concern of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. As its Chairman, Walter W. Heller, put it, "Even a mild recovery could make the year 1961 the 'best year ever' in terms of gross national output. Yet at the same time it could be the worst postwar year for unemployment."

Gross national product, the broad measure of the economy as a whole, covering the value of all goods produced and services rendered, rose from \$444 billion in 1958 to \$482 billion in 1959 and \$503 billion in 1960. Its peak annual rate level was \$505 billion in the second quarter of 1960, after which it slumped to around \$503 billion in the second

half, the year as a whole showing a rise of some 4% over 1959 and nearly 3% after allowing for price changes. Furthermore, after allowance for the rise in population, the per capita gain in GNP in constant dollars in 1960 was only a little over 1%, or nothing like the growth rate that had been predicted for this first year of the "Soaring Sixties."

Industrial Production: The leading indicator of industrial output, the Federal Reserve index, a measure of physical rather than dollar volume, rose in the first part of 1959, continuing the weak and short recovery from the recession of 1957-58.

Under the impact of inventory accumulation in anticipation of the prolonged steel strike, the index (1957 = 100) advanced from around 100 in January 1959 to nearly 110 in June, slumped a little in the summer and still more, during the strike, to around 102. After the strike, again stimulated by inventory rebuilding, it shot up to a peak of 111 in January 1960. But it did not reach this point again and started to drift down after mid-year. By the first quarter of 1961 it had fallen again to 102. The decline occurred mainly in the heavy good industries such as steel, automobiles and construction. In fact, hard goods output began to decline in February 1960 when steel production turned down. Soft goods, on the other hand, rose in the first half and then slumped moderately after midyear.

Inventories: Business inventories were built up rapidly during 1959 before the steel strike and continued to be increased after being pulled down some, but far less than expected, during the strike. The build-up of steel and hard goods inventories after the strike was rapid. As a result inventories in manufacturing and trade combined soared to a total of \$92.3 billion by March 1960 compared with \$88.4 billion at the end of November 1959. They continued to rise to around \$93.5 billion in June 1960 as sales weakened. After that business started to reduce stocks on hand by cutting orders for goods and by curtailing production. Inventories were thus reduced by about \$1.3 billion in the last half of the year, but consumer buying fell even more, by about \$2.7 billion. As a result, the relationship of inventories to sales was worse than at mid-year when the inventory reductions began.

Capital Spending: Business expenditures for plant and equipment which had started to increase in the final months of 1958 continued to rise slowly through 1959 and the first half of 1960, but the total of \$35.7 billion reached for that year as a whole was considerably less than the \$36.9 billion reached 3 years before in 1957.

As sales and production lagged in 1960 and many industries were forced to operate at only 50-75% of capacity, investment in new capacity turned down and was still slumping in the early months of 1961. Latest official survey indicated that the 1961 total would be around \$34.6 billion, or at least 3% under the 1960 level.

Retail Sales: After declining in the 1958 recession, retail sales in stores, which account for about 45% of the nation's total output of goods and services, rose slowly through 1959 into the early months of 1960 reaching a peak in April. After this they trailed off through most of the remaining months, rising a little in the final quarter. The weakening demand for consumer durable goods after midyear reflected the economic slump and the rise in unemployment.

For 1960 as a whole, retail sales totaled \$220 billion or less than 2% over 1959. As *Sales Management* (March 3, 1961) noted, "This is a disappointing performance, not only because it is less than the 3% gain necessary to keep pace with the rise in production and prices, but because once again the increase in sales falls short of the corresponding gain in disposable income which amounted to 6%."

Price Movements: The general level of commodity prices as measured by government indexes has changed little in the last 3 years. The monthly average of the wholesale price index (1947-49 = 100) averaged 119.2 for 1958 and 119.6 in 1960. Industrial prices moved a little higher in this period but farm products and processed foods were somewhat lower.

Despite this stability in the wholesale index, the consumer price index, a rough measure of the cost of living for city wage-earners and clerical-worker families, rose by about 3% during, 1959-60. Due to the sag in consumer demand the retail price of commodities other than food did not go up in 1960. But the consumer food price index rose 3.1%.

Rise in prices of consumer services has been higher than for the combined index. The annual average percentage increase in the 3-year period, January 1958 to January 1961, was 2.6% for services compared with 1.4% for the consumer price index as a whole and less than 1% for foods and goods. In the year 1960 alone services rose 2.4%, with rents and medical care in the lead.

The purchasing power of the consumer dollar fell to about 47 cents in comparison with its prewar level in 1935-1936. Compared with its postwar 1947-1949 level it has fallen to around 78 cents.

Consumer Credit: Debts of consumers continued to mount through most of the two-year period the total outstanding rising from around \$45.5 billion at the end of 1958 to \$56 billion at the end of 1960, of which \$43 billion was instalment debt.

There was some decline in the amount of credit extended in the later months of 1960, largely due to the falling off in sales of cars and other consumer durable goods. By January 1961 repayments of consumer instalment debt (seasonably adjusted) exceeded credit extended for the first month since September 1958.

An increasing proportion of total consumer income has been going to repayment of instalment loans. In 1946 after World War II only a little over 4% of consumer income went to repayment of instalment loans and about 10% in 1950. But now the amount necessary to appease the instalment collectors comes to around 13%. At the same time delinquencies have been mounting as workers out of jobs are unable to meet the instalments on their loans.

Business Failures: A sensitive indicator of economic conditions is the rate of industrial and commercial failures. The number of such failures in 1960 reached a 27-year high, with about 1,300 firms shutting down each month. Total reported failures for the year numbered 15,445 compared with the previous high of 19,859 in the crisis year 1933. This was a rise of 9% over 1959 and 3% more than in the recession year 1958. The rate of failures also has risen recently from around 52 failures per 10,000 firms in 1959 to 57 in 1960 with the rate running well above 60 in the last four months of 1960, and reaching 64 by February, 1961. (Business failures actually represent a small part of all business discontinuances, including only those involving proceedings in the courts or voluntary action in which creditors are likely to sustain losses.)

The number of bankruptcy cases filed in federal courts in the fiscal year 1960 also reached a new high of 110,034, or more than 50% above the total at the depth of the Great Depression in the 1930's. Almost all the increase in recent years has come from wage-earning employees and other non-business groups which together account for about 90% of all bankruptcies.

Housing Slump: In the 1960-61 downturn housing failed to serve as an anti-recession force. Private nonfarm housing "starts" for 1960 as a whole totaled 1,216,000 or 19% below the 1959 total. This intensified the impact of the recession.

At the same time higher home costs resulted in growing vacancy rates, impeding construction activity. The BLS index of housing costs rose to an all-time high and mortgage interest charges hovered around 6%, considerably higher than in previous recessions.

The rising vacancy rates were in the higher priced homes, thus discouraging builders from erecting more luxury housing. Low-cost housing for which the need continued to rise, did not have the same profit attraction for them.

FEWER FARMERS, MORE CROPS

The continuing farm crisis has led to less buying by farmers thus tending to pull down consumer purchases. At the same time the percentage of the U.S. population engaged in farming keeps on declining and is now about 11%. The farm population numbers approximately 20 million compared with 32 million a quarter of a century ago.

Total number of farms in the U.S., the latest Census of Agriculture (1959) finds, had declined about 23% to only 3.7 million or a million fewer than in 1954. Commenting on these figures, Farm Research Inc. says, "Concentration in agriculture is now moving at breakneck speed." (*Facts for Farmers*, April, 1961.) Between 1950 and 1954 the rate of elimination of farms was 11%, but in the latest period, 1954-1959, it was nearly 18%. At the same time, "The big farms have become bigger and more numerous" while the largest decrease in number has occurred in farms having less than 220 acres. "No matter how one looks at them the figures . . . of the 1959 Census reveal a stark picture of mounting instability and insecurity for most rural farm families." Probably another 200,000 farms have been eliminated in the two years since the 1959 Census.

Despite the decline in number of farms total farm output in 1960 was nearly 30% above the 1947-49 postwar level. The index (with 1947-49 equal to a base of 100) moved up from 114 in 1957 to 124 in 1958, to 126 in 1959 and 129 in 1960. This output in 1960 came from some 328 million acres of cropland harvested, about the same as in 1958.

Net realized farm income fell from \$13 billion in 1958 to \$11.3 billion in 1959, turning up slightly to \$11.6 billion in 1960. Farm proprietors' personal income in 1960 was less than 3% of total

personal income for the whole country, and a little lower than in 1959 and 1958.

Average income of persons living on farms is well below half that of the nonfarm population. Per capita income of persons on farms, including income from nonfarm sources, fell from \$1,068 in 1958 to \$965 in 1959, then rose slightly to \$986 in 1960. The comparable figures for the nonfarm population were \$2,034, \$2,216 and \$2,282.

Movement of prices is still against the farmer. Index of prices received by farmers for all farm products (1910-14 = 100) slipped lower, from 250 in 1958 to 240 in 1959 and to 238 in 1960. At the same time prices they paid for all items they bought continued to rise slightly. The resulting "parity ratio" thus declined from 85 in 1958 to 81 in 1959 and to 80 in 1960.

At the same time, although retail food prices have risen, the farmer's share of the consumer food dollar shrank from a postwar peak of 54¢ in 1945 to 38¢ in 1958 and 1959. It was only 39¢ in 1960 or 15¢ less than the postwar high in 1945.

By the end of 1960 the government had over \$9 billion of farm surplus stored away with storage charges running to about \$2 million a day. It was estimated that in 1960 there was enough wheat in storage to feed the whole nation for two years without growing another bushel.

CORPORATE PROFITS AND DIVIDENDS

Profits of U.S. corporations before taxes, as established by the Department of Commerce, rose by nearly \$10 billion or almost a fourth between 1958 and 1959 as the economy recovered from the 1957-58 recession. Then, as another recession set in, profits moved down again in 1960, declining in that year by around \$2 billion.

For profits after taxes the trend was similar with the corporate total rising from \$19.1 billion in 1958 to \$23.8 billion in 1959, then declining to \$23 billion in 1960. The first quarter of 1960 saw the profit peak for the period with a seasonally adjusted annual rate of \$48.8 billion before taxes and \$25 billion after taxes.

The government's estimates of profits, taxes, dividends and undistributed profits in recent years, updating those given in previous Fact Books, are included in the following table. They cover the prewar year 1939, the war year 1945 and ten later years through 1960.

Year	Corporate profit before taxes	Corporate profit after taxes (billions of dollars)	Dividend payments	Undistributed profit
1939	6.4	5.0	3.8	1.2
1945	19.0	8.3	4.7	3.6
1951	42.2	19.7	9.0	10.7
1952	36.7	17.2	9.0	8.3
1953	38.3	18.1	9.2	8.9
1954	34.1	16.8	9.8	7.0
1955	44.9	23.0	11.2	11.8
1956	44.7	23.5	12.1	11.3
1957	43.2	22.3	12.6	9.7
1958	37.7	19.1	12.4	6.7
1959	47.0	23.8	13.4	10.5
1960	45.0	23.0	14.0	9.0

Note that despite the decline in net profits in 1960 the dividends distributed to stockholders rose to around \$14 billion compared with \$13.4 billion in 1959. (All 1960 estimates are preliminary.)

For 3,331 leading companies included in the annual compilation of the First National City Bank, combined profits showed a rise in 1959 over 1958 of 18%, with manufacturing companies alone reporting a rise of 25%. For 1960 the same bank's compilation of 3,433 companies in all industries showed a rise of less than a half of 1%, with manufacturing companies as a group showing a decline of 4% from 1959 as recession factors influenced them.

Bank Profits: Heavy demand for loans and rising interest rates increased the prosperity and profits of the banks, especially the large Wall Street institutions.

For 1960 *Business Week* (Feb. 4) noted that the 23 big billion-dollar banks (each with deposits of more than \$1 billion) showed net operating profits that "were up sharply right across the board," about 12% for the group. This was on top of the 14.5% rise reported by these billion-dollar banks for 1959. "Earnings of all the largest banks reached new peaks in 1960."

Depreciation Allowances: In reports of corporate profits a major factor tending to understate real profits are excessive depreciation allowances. These are considered as "costs" and appear on the books as an offset to profits. Actually, however, the funds retained as the result of excessive charges for depreciation are just as much a return to a company as those derived from what is designated as profits. Depreciation allowances have been rising steadily over recent years and were reported as around \$20.5 billion in the government estimates

for 1958, rising to \$21.8 billion in 1959 and \$23.1 billion in 1960.

In criticizing present Administration proposals for allowing larger or more "liberal" depreciation, United Steelworkers' economists, after a special study, point out that any further "liberalization" would benefit chiefly the large already profitable companies, and would have the effect of reducing reported profits. This reduction in reported profits would place an effective propaganda weapon in the hands of business that it would use "in seeking a reduction in corporate taxes and in resisting collective bargaining demands." (*Steel Labor*, Feb. 1961.) It would also entail a loss in revenue for the government which would have to be made up through increased taxes on other groups, and might even lead to a federal sales tax.

U.S. BUDGET FOR WAR

"The United States is spending more on armaments than any other nation, \$46 billion annually for missiles, manpower, tanks, guns, ships, atomic explosives and military aid to allies." This line from an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, February 25, 1961, told only the story of one year. For in the last eleven years (1951 through 1961) the admitted and unconcealed military expenditures of the U.S. have reached the approximate total of \$470 billion. The figures for these fiscal years are as follows:

1951—\$22.4 billion	1957—\$43.3 billion
1952— 44.0 "	1958— 44.1 "
1953— 50.4 "	1959— 46.4 "
1954— 46.9 "	1960— 45.6 "
1955— 40.6 "	1961— 45.9 "
1956— 40.6 "	

The enormity of this sum is contrasted with the \$341 billion of total business expenditures for new plant and equipment in the roughly identical period—the calendar years 1951 through 1961, the latest year estimated. The U.S. armament expenditures have thus exceeded capital expenditures in this period by \$129 billion, or by 38%.

After Congress had adjourned in 1960 the Friends Committee on National Legislation in its November *Washington Newsletter* reported that, overall, Congress had appropriated \$83.3 billion, most of this money being spent in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

By far the largest sum, \$47 billion, or more than \$260 per capita, was voted for current military programs, or over \$800 million more

than was appropriated for this purpose the previous year. An additional \$5.5 billion was voted for veterans' benefits. Interest on the national debt (a permanent appropriation) totals \$9 billion, most of this debt having been created during war years.

Congress thus voted over 56% of its total appropriations for current military programs including atomic energy and foreign military aid. And if we include the amounts for past wars (veterans and other costs plus administration of the national debt) the total for wars past, present and future comes to around about 74% of the amount appropriated.

Examination of the federal budget for fiscal 1961 shows an even higher proportion going for major national security expenditures, interest on the public debt and veterans services. The total of these three items came to about \$60.7 billion or to 76% of the budget in that year.

This figure is actually an understatement. For included in seemingly peaceful categories of government spending are significant "defense" items, for example, funds for the Federal Bureau of Investigation as well as the House Un-American Activities Committee (see Chapter V) both of which devote part of their efforts to eliminating opposition to the cold war.

Even the Washington business letters admit the overwhelmingly large part of the taxpayer's dollar that goes to war. One of them early in 1960 put it bluntly: "It's war or defense that takes the lion's share. Defense, veterans, foreign aid, interest on war debt, etc., eat up 80%." All the rest of government, health, welfare, relief, get the remaining 20%. "War is expensive; it hogs the taxes. If we can ever get a sort of peace, we can have much more of everything else that we need, but not before."

Decline in Non-war Spending: While military and related expenditures have expanded continuously since the beginning of World War I, the same cannot be said for the government's expenditures on welfare and social benefits. When military spending is excluded from government expenditures and the military component is also eliminated from the gross national product figure, we find that the share of government spending in the gross national product increased only from 7.5% in 1929 to 10.3% in 1957.

Recent studies by Francis M. Bator (*The Question of Government Spending*) showed that the ratio of nondefense government spending to nondefense gross national product was only 10.8% in 1957 compared

with 13.4% back in 1939 and 12% in 1940, a period of active war preparations.

The same story is told in the figures compiled by Kenneth Boulding for an article in *Daedalus*, Fall, 1960. Comparing total governmental nonmilitary expenditures (state, local and federal) as a percentage of the gross national product, he finds that the proportion of *civilian* government spending to total output was 10.7% back in 1929 and only a trifle higher, 10.9% in 1959. This was the fact even after the New Deal reforms of the thirties had considerably increased such civilian or nonmilitary expenditures from the pre-crisis levels of 1929.

Boulding's and Batton's figures thus indicate that there has been a relative decline in total peaceful (nondefense) government spending since the 1930's.

More for Arms: The revised Kennedy budget for fiscal 1962 called for total estimated spending for all purposes of \$83.4 billion of which "national security" accounts for \$48.2 billion, a boost of about \$800 million over the Eisenhower arms budget. At the same time the *New York Times* (March 26, 1961) reported on a "high powered drive of the armed services, their contractors, and members of Congress to get, keep, or expand their shares" of the growing military budget.

In his farewell address to the American people, January 17, Eisenhower admitted the dangerous power of the Pentagon and the military and scientific elite which he had been unable to control. He spoke of the "conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry," and warned against the "acquisition of unwarranted influence . . . by the military industrial complex."

FEDERAL TAX BURDEN

No basic changes in federal tax laws were made in the last two years and the relative weight of taxation on the various classes in the population remain substantially the same as indicated in earlier Fact Books and in our pamphlet, *The Burden of Taxes*. Extensive congressional hearings revealed the same inequities. It was shown again that the amount of income actually taxed by the federal government is still less than one-half the total personal income of the nation. This is the result of various loopholes, exclusions, deductions, credits and other benefits written into the tax law and aiding mainly upper-income groups.

If both individual and corporation sectors are included, it is estimated that some \$30 billion of potential revenue is lost annually—about \$25 billion through loopholes and special privileges and about \$5 billion through illegal evasion. Most of this benefits corporations and persons in higher income brackets. Wage and salaried workers, having their taxes withheld at the source, can neither evade the income tax nor benefit from the loopholes enjoyed by the wealthy.

A detailed estimate of some of the revenues lost through special privileges indicates that elimination of these loopholes would increase tax revenues by nearly \$18 billion a year. These were summarized in a recent book *Federal Taxes* (AFL-CIO Publication No. 108) using material from the latest congressional hearings. The largest amount (\$4.6 billion a year) would be saved by the elimination of the special treatment of capital gains on the sale of property such as stock and real estate, which is the type of income enjoyed by upper income classes.

The congressional hearings showed also that although personal incomes above \$100,000 a year are supposed to be taxed from 67% to 90% the average rate of taxation is only about 35%.

GOLD AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

U.S. capitalism was badly shaken in the latter part of 1960 by a sudden rise in the price of gold on the London market. At one point it reached \$41 an ounce, \$6 more than the U.S. Treasury price.

At the same time gold started flowing out of the U.S. at an unprecedented rate. During the last quarter of 1960 about \$1.2 billion was shipped to foreign central banks, compared with only \$50 million in the first quarter.

A large part of this gold reached the hands of foreign private speculators. Americans also were hoarding gold abroad until this was outlawed in one of the last acts of the Eisenhower administration. Speculators were gambling that loss of confidence in the dollar would lead to its devaluation. Since this would raise the price of gold the hoarders expected to make big profits. However, by April, 1961 devaluation had not followed and the gold price had fallen to its previous levels. The speculators were at least temporarily routed.

Loss of confidence in the dollar was the result of the huge balance of payments deficit as well as the fourth postwar recession. Since 1957 Americans have been spending more in foreign countries than foreigners

have been spending here. The payments deficit against the U.S. had risen from \$3.5 billion in 1958 to \$3.8 billion in both the two following years. These deficits have been the result mainly of the cold-war expenditures for U.S. military bases abroad which averaged \$3.2 billion a year in 1958-1960.

These dollars, piling up in foreign banks, cut the purchasing power of the American people and contributed to the latest recession. As Edward Bernstein, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, noted, the balance of payments deficit "has caused aggregate demand in the U.S. to fall short of the level that would be expected from our income and output" and has had "a depressing effect on production and employment" here. Even during peaks in the business cycle, he concluded, "the persistent balance-of-payments deficit has been a serious impediment to the proper functioning of the economy."

In its efforts to stem the outflow of gold the Kennedy Administration took measures to keep short-term interest rates higher than they would normally have been, thus contributing to the business slump. So long as the cold war is conducted, with its huge outlays for military bases abroad, economic stagnation is likely to persist and unemployment to continue high in the United States.

II. SOCIAL AND LABOR CONDITIONS

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

About one in five (19%), or more than ⁴⁴15 million of all consumer spending units in the United States, received less than \$2,000 in total income, before taxes, in 1959. This was reported by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center in its 1960 Survey of Consumer Finances.

Included in the 19% with incomes below the poverty line of \$2,000 were about 4 million consumer spending units receiving less than \$1,000 in the year. At the other end of the scale were 6.4 million units (11%) with incomes of \$10,000 or more. These included about 1 million (2%) receiving \$15,000 and over.

As always in these studies of consumer finances, the "spending unit" consists of all related persons living together who pool their incomes. If a husband, wife and children under 18 are living together at home, they are considered to be members of the same "spending unit." Families are divided into two or more units if they include adult relatives who do not pool their incomes.

Spending units in the U. S. were estimated to total 58.5 million in 1959. Percentages indicating distribution of money income, as reported in the 1960 Survey of Consumer Finances may be grouped cumulatively, as follows:

4,095,000 (7%)	received less than \$1,000
11,115,000 (19%)	" " " 2,000
16,965,000 (29%)	" " " 3,000
23,400,000 (40%)	" " " 4,000
30,420,000 (52%)	" " " 5,000
39,780,000 (68%)	" " " 6,000
45,630,000 (78%)	" " " 7,500
12,870,000 (22%)	" \$7,500 and over
6,435,000 (11%)	" \$10,000 and over
1,170,000 (2%)	" \$15,000 and over

As these figures show, about 30.4 million (52%) of the consumer spending units in 1959 received less than \$5,000, and these were included in the 39.7 million (68%) who received less than \$6,000. Yet in that year, the standard Heller budget for a family of four called for \$6,271 and the City Worker's Family Budget of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics called for \$6,084. Thus, about two-thirds of all spending units in this country in 1959 were unable to meet even a modest family budget.

Distribution of Liquid Assets: Consumer savings in liquid asset holdings were also included in the 1960 Survey of Consumer Finances. About one-fourth (24%) of the spending units early in 1960 had no government savings bonds, no checking or savings accounts in banks, no shares in savings and loan associations or in credit unions.

This 24% of all spending units without liquid assets of any kind is the same proportion shown in 1957. Those with holdings of as much as \$500 or more represented less than half (49%) of all spending units.

Proportion of all spending units holding assets of \$10,000 or more had increased from 3% in 1950, to 4% in 1957 and 5% in 1960. As this annual survey has pointed out in recent years, liquid assets are accumulated largely from income, so it is natural that holdings are concentrated mainly in the higher income groups.

Stock Ownership: Only 14.3% of the 58.5 million spending units in the U. S. in 1959 held any stock at all in corporations, the Michigan Survey Research Center reported. In other words, less than one out of every seven owned any stock. But the top 2.5% held stock having a value equal to 42% of the total value of all shares outstanding. About two-thirds (64%) of all stockownership is concentrated in the hands of only 5.7% of all units. On this basis less than 6% of all units collected a total of about \$8.6 billion of the \$13.4 billion in dividends paid out by corporations to stockholders in 1959.

Family Income Census: Of 45 million families in the U. S., more than 6 million (about 13.4% of all), had incomes of less than \$2,000 a year in 1959. In reporting these figures on distribution of income the Bureau of the Census refers to families, not "spending units" as defined above. (*Consumer Income*, Jan. 5, 1961.) Included in these 6 million low-income families are more than 20 million persons.

With the steady rise in living costs the poverty level is more realistically set as a family income below \$3,000 a year. About 10.2 million families, nearly 23% or about one in 4 of the 45 million, had incomes of less

than \$3,000 in 1959. Included in these below-\$3,000-a-year families are some 33.9 million persons.

At the lower end of the income scale were 2.3 million families (about 5% or one in 20), including 7.6 million persons, with incomes of less than \$1,000 in 1959. And of these, about 1.1 million families (including 3.6 million persons) or 2.4% of all, had incomes under \$500. In other words, they were subsisting on less than \$10 a week for the whole family or an average of about 40c per person per day.

At the top of the scale were 1,413,000 families, including about 4.7 million persons, who had incomes of \$15,000 or more. These upper-income families represented about 3% of the total. Included at the very top was a wealthy group of 315,000 families, less than 1% (0.7%) of all, with incomes of \$25,000 or more.

The median or half-way mark for all families in 1959 was \$5,417, half having more and half having less than that amount. Even this relatively high median fell short by \$567 of the City Worker's Family Budget.

Income of Negroes: "Nonwhite" families in the U.S. in 1959 had a median income of \$2,917, only a little more than half (52%) of the white families' median of \$5,643. In 1957-58 it had also been 52% of the white median, so there was no improvement. About 96% of all "nonwhites" are Negroes, so the Census use of this classification applies mainly to the Negro people.

This report on Consumer Income in 1959 from the U. S. Bureau of the Census shows also that more than a third of all Negro families (36.2%) had incomes of less than \$2,000. But among white families, only 11.2% had less than \$2,000 in that year. Among higher income groups, only 15.4% of Negro families had incomes of \$6,000 or more, while more than four out of 10 (45%) of all white families were in that category.

Rural farm families revealed a wide difference between Negro and white. Negro farm families had a median in 1959 of only \$1,136 or about 36% of the \$3,151 median of white farm families.

Among women, the difference in income between Negro and white was clearly shown in these Census figures. The median income of Negro women (over 14 years of age) was only \$809 in 1959, but white women's median was \$1,313. The median earnings of Negro women as workers were only \$1,289, while for white women workers the median was \$2,422 or almost twice as much.

In Detroit, in the 8-year period between 1951 and 1959, the median income of Negroes rose from \$3,500 to \$3,800, a gain of 8%, the Michigan Survey Research Center reported. But in the same period the median income of white persons in the city rose from \$4,800 to \$6,400, or 33%. As the report stated: "Between 1951 and 1959 the median family income of whites grew four times faster than was the case for Negro Detroiters."

REAL WAGES AND WAGE DIFFERENTIALS

Effect of the increase in living costs on real wages is indicated in the monthly report of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics on weekly earnings and take-home pay of production workers in manufacturing. This shows the gross average weekly earnings of these factory workers in current dollars; and also in 1947-49 dollars, allowing for the rise in consumer prices, to reflect "real earnings." To show the average amount of take-home pay it then deducts from gross weekly earnings the amounts for federal income and for social security taxes. The amount of tax to be paid by each worker varies with the number of his dependents.

With these adjustments, the BLS then reports each month on average "net spendable earnings" for two typical workers, one with no dependents and one with 3 dependents. The results reveal how small a gain in real earnings these factory workers have actually made during the past 4 years. Here are the figures from the BLS monthly reports in its publication, *Employment and Earnings*, in terms of 1947-49 dollars:

Period	Gross average weekly earnings	Net spendable average weekly earnings	
		Worker with no dependents	Worker with 3 dependents
1956	\$68.84	\$56.68	\$63.01
1957	68.54	56.21	62.37
1958	67.61	55.43	61.44
1959	71.81	58.45	64.49
Dec. 1959	73.43	59.70	65.74
Dec. 1960	70.24	56.82	62.72

For the worker with no dependents take-home pay in terms of 1947-49 dollars averaged \$56.68 a week in 1956, declined to \$55.43 in 1958, rose

to \$59.70 by December 1959, only to decline to \$56.82 in December 1960. His net gain in the 4-year period was 14c a week. But during the past year between December 1959 and December 1960 (in 1947-49 dollars) he lost an average of \$2.88 a week in net spendable weekly earnings.

For the worker with 3 dependents, spendable earnings averaged \$63.01 a week in 1956, declined to \$61.44 in 1958, rose to \$64.49 in 1959, and declined again to \$62.72 by December 1960. His net loss for the 4-year period was 29c a week. But he lost \$3.02 in take-home pay between December 1959 and December 1960.

Substandard Wage Rates: In retail trade in the country as a whole, workers averaged only \$1.82 an hour in October 1960, compared with \$2.30 an hour in manufacturing. Retail store executives have been lobbying to keep their exemption from minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. If they were included they would have to pay retail employees the minimum of \$1 an hour.

New York State in April 1960, passed a law establishing a state-wide minimum wage of \$1 an hour. This was the first measure in New York's history to create a wage floor on a state-wide basis. The bill added 700,000 workers to basic wage coverage, bringing to 2 million the number covered by the state-wide law. Retail workers (except outside salesmen) are among those covered in that state.

In the country as a whole about 2.1 million retail trade workers were getting less than \$1.25 an hour at the end of 1960, while some 917,000 of them were earning less than \$1 an hour.

Textile workers in October 1960 averaged \$1.62 an hour, hotel workers only \$1.24. Of all hotel workers in the U. S. about 174,000 were getting less than \$1.25 an hour at the end of 1960, and of these about 158,000 were receiving less than \$1.

In some New York City hospitals wages of non-professional workers had been as low as 80c an hour in early 1959 until agreement after a strike brought the minimum up to \$1, with a 40-hour week. Other workers in the country as a whole who were receiving less than \$1.25 an hour at the 1960 year-end included 126,000 employees in repair shops and movie theaters; and 148,000 in laundries and cleaning plants, of whom 78,000 are paid less than \$1 an hour.

Low Weekly Averages: In October 1960 when production workers in manufacturing averaged \$91.08 a week, tobacco workers in stemming and drying plants averaged only \$52.82, sawmill workers in the

South averaged \$54.47 while seamless hosiery workers in the South averaged \$53.82, workers in knitting mills averaged \$57.46, and textile workers in the industry as a whole averaged \$62.86.

In the apparel industry average weekly earnings were only \$56.60, while workers on women's and children's undergarments averaged \$53.42, and those on women's dresses averaged \$56.88.

Thus, the differential between factory workers' average weekly earnings of over \$91 and the average in these low-wage industries ranged from \$28 up to about \$38 a week. In other words, workers in these low-paid groups earned on the average from 30% to 40% less than the general average for all factory workers. And workers in laundries averaged 47% less—\$47.97 a week in November compared with \$90.16 in manufacturing industries. (See also section on Migrant Workers.)

Low Wages and "Moonlighting": Because of low pay on regular jobs and the rise in living costs, a larger number of workers in various fields have taken to "moonlighting," working at 2 jobs in order to boost weekly take-home pay. Union leaders point out, however, that it is not fair for one man to have 2 jobs when some workers are without a job of any kind. Those holding 1½ jobs or 2 jobs deprive another man of work. But an increase in part-time work has led more workers to seek additional income from another part-time job.

In a special survey of this trend toward double jobs, the *Wall Street Journal* (Dec. 6, 1960) found the slow-down in work has led many in various part of the U.S. to seek 2 part-time jobs: "Others turn to moonlighting because they find that even by putting in a full week at their principal job they can't . . . make ends meet." An employment agency official said: "People tell us their main job isn't enough to cover the cost of living."

Some teachers were driving cabs after school hours. Many New York City policemen took off-duty jobs to supplement their incomes and got into trouble with the Police Commissioner who fined them for doing so. In San Francisco some firemen have taken on carpentering jobs.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that in December 1959 there were 3 million workers with more than one job, of whom about 700,000 were factory workers. "Postal workers are more likely than other workers to have second jobs, and so are teachers and protective service workers—guards, firemen and the like." (*Monthly Labor Review*, Oct. 1960.)

WAGE GAINS IN UNION CONTRACTS

About 8.7 million workers in manufacturing gained wage increases during 1959. They represented about 83% of those employed in factories where wage changes are made through collective bargaining, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported. Most common increase in 1959 averaged 9¢ but less than 10¢ an hour. About 2.5 million workers gained higher increases, from 10¢ up to 19¢ or more. If premium pay for overtime is included, most frequent increases in 1959 were 3½% but less than 4%.

Excluding deferred and cost-of-living adjustments, increases granted during 1959 amounted most frequently to 7¢ but less than 8¢ an hour, or 3% but less than 3.5%. About 331,000 skilled workers received extra increases.

Many of these wage gains resulted from strikes, as shown in our record of major strikes. (See Trade Union chapter.) In unionized plants new or liberalized benefits covered about two-thirds of all employees, the AFL-CIO showed in its monthly *Collective Bargaining Report*.

On the other hand, about 1.8 million, or 17% of workers in manufacturing covered by BLS surveys, received no general wage rate increase in 1959, while about 4,000 workers (less than 1%) were forced to accept a pay cut.

In many cases adjustments for consumer price changes supplemented other kinds of wage changes, but about 800,000 workers, an unusually large number, received only these cost-of-living "escalator" adjustment raises in 1959.

Gains in 1960: Wage gains continued in 1960 on a basis similar to 1959 and involving about 7 million workers. The over-all median raise through collective bargaining was estimated at 9.4¢ an hour, slightly higher than in 1959. For about 1.4 million workers, or one-fifth of those receiving increases, the wage boosts averaged 10¢ but less than 11¢ an hour.

Major contracts negotiated in 1960 covered a total of about 4.4 million workers. Wage increases negotiated or effective under major collective bargaining contracts covered a total of 6,950,000 workers. Some 2.7 million received deferred wage increases, cost-of-living adjustments, or both, under major contracts negotiated in previous years.

In all major collective bargaining settlements negotiated in 1960 a total of 97% of the workers covered received wage increases while only 3% had "no wage change."

Cost-of-living escalator clauses in 1960 bargaining were modified by steel companies and eliminated by railroads and some electrical companies in moves which cut the total number of workers covered by such clauses from 3.3 million in January, 1960 down to 2.8 million in January, 1961.

Among major wage gains won through collective bargaining in 1960 were the following: aircraft, 4¢ to 11¢ an hour for 80,000 represented by Auto Workers and Machinists; apparel, 17.5¢ for 125,000 workers in men's and boys' clothing; construction, 15¢ to 20¢; railroads, 10.5¢; rubber, 4¢ to 9.5¢; steel, 16.4¢; telephone, 7.3¢; textiles, about 5%; and utilities, 4 to 5%.

FAMILY BUDGETS

Often used in trade union collective bargaining, family budgets indicate the cost of goods and services required for a worker's family trying to maintain the so-called American standard of living. Budgets recently priced are described below.

City Worker's Family Budget: In its revised City Worker's Family Budget, priced as of autumn 1959, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that rising prices and higher standards have brought this budget up to a new high. Total costs of goods and services for a family of four in 20 cities in 1959 were reported as about 40% above the costs in the same cities in the old budget originally priced in 1951. (See *Monthly Labor Review*, Aug. 1960.)

This new budget is described as showing "the amount necessary to maintain a modest but adequate level of living" for a worker's family of four, including employed husband, a wife not gainfully employed, and two children, a girl of 8 and a boy of 13. It aims to estimate the amount required for such a family to maintain adequate living on prevailing standards of what is needed for health, efficiency, nurture of children, and participation in social and community activities.

Amounts needed to provide this standard ranged from \$4,370 a year or \$103 a week in Houston, up to \$6,567 a year or \$126 a week in Chicago. The average for the 20 cities was \$6,084 or about \$117 a week.

Here are the amounts called for in the various cities: Atlanta, \$5,642; Baltimore, \$5,718; Boston, \$6,317; Chicago, \$6,567; Cincinnati, \$6,100; Cleveland, \$6,199; Detroit, \$6,072; Houston, \$5,370; Kansas City, \$5,964; Los Angeles, \$6,285.

Also, Minneapolis, \$6,181; New York, \$5,970; Philadelphia, \$5,898; Pittsburgh, \$6,199; Portland, Ore., \$6,222; St. Louis, \$6,266; San Francisco, \$6,304; Scranton, \$5,693; Seattle, \$6,562; Washington, D. C., \$6,147.

\$117 a Week: In terms of weekly amounts as most workers' families measure their income and outgo by the week, this standard family budget in 1959 called for an average of about \$117 a week, varying somewhat according to the city. But in 1960, production workers in manufacturing averaged less than \$91 in weekly earnings, so that the average amount earned fell below the budget by about \$26.

A factory worker trying to meet this budget standard for a 4-person family on average weekly earnings would thus incur a deficit of about \$26 a week or about \$1,352 a year.

A special study prepared for the AFL-CIO found that "in most U.S. cities, wages run \$7 to \$42 a week less than local living costs, and most typically are about \$20 below this modest living standard." Moreover, an average wage of \$91 a week does not mean that the worker earns 52 times that amount in the year. For most workers earning the average wage are not employed every week in the year.

Average weekly earnings of building construction workers come closest to meeting the city worker's budget standard, but irregular work through the year pulls their annual earnings below the budget level.

Modest Standard: Although the new city worker's budget reflects a somewhat higher living standard than the old one, it still represents an essentially modest level of living. For food, for example, it allows about \$33 a week for the 4-person family. But this allows only 1½ pounds of meat (or fish) for supper and ½ pound for lunch. Its egg allowance is only 3½ a day for the 4 persons, including eggs used in cooking.

For housing costs (including rent, heat and utilities) the budget allows, on the average, less than \$100 a month. Other goods and services come to about \$42 a week. Taxes (federal, state and local) are estimated at about \$600 a year. But the only kinds of savings covered by this budget are through life insurance premiums, social security

deductions, and employee contributions to disability insurance required in California and New York.

Latest Heller Budgets: The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics of the University of California prices each year a budget for a wage-earner's family of four, including a man, woman, boy of 13 and girl of 8. It is priced for the San Francisco Bay Area, but has been widely recognized by trade unions in collective bargaining as a standard budget applicable also to other areas of the U.S.

As priced in September, 1960, this budget called for \$6,488 a year (including income and sales taxes) or a little over \$124 a week if the wage-earner rents the home. For the home-owner, the budget allows \$6,892 (about \$132 a week) to include expenses for repairs, upkeep, real estate taxes and mortgage interest.

This Heller budget for a home-renter's family called for about \$184 more per year than the government's City Worker's Family Budget for a San Francisco wage-earner. When compared with the average of the city worker's family budget for 20 cities, the Heller standard provides about \$400 more per year.

The amount allowed for rent of a 4 or 5-room dwelling is only \$804 a year or \$67 a month. The budget allows about \$238 a year (about \$4.50 a week) for all recreation for the family, including a vacation of 1 week in a rented cabin or tent (at \$47), TV expenses and movies.

As in previous years, the Heller committee also priced a budget for a salaried junior professional and executive worker. As of September 1960 this salaried worker's budget called for \$9,816 a year or about \$188 a week.

HOURS OF WORK

With unemployment steadily rising during 1960, average hours of work in manufacturing industries declined to 38.8 a week in December 1960, compared with an average of 40.3 in the year 1959. This was the shortest workweek of any December since World War II, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported. In nondurable goods average hours were only 38.2 in December 1960. For the year 1960 as a whole, the work week in manufacturing averaged 39.7; in durable goods, 40.1; in nondurable goods, 39.1.

In nonmanufacturing industries, weekly hours in 1960 averaged

somewhat longer: for example, in retail trade, 40.2; railroads, 41.8; metal mining, 42.

Part-time Work: Because of slack work and other economic reasons, part-time employment rose during 1960. About 1,454,000 nonfarm workers who usually work full-time were on reduced hours during the survey week in December 1960—300,000 more than in December 1959. This number had been increasing since July and was at the highest level since the spring of 1958.

In addition there were 1,300,000 other workers who usually work part-time only because they are unable to find a job of steady, full week's work. The phrase "for economic reasons," as used by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, indicates that wage-earners take what work they can get when full-time employment is hard to find. For workers on part-time for economic reasons who "usually work full time at present job," hours of work averaged only 24.5 a week in 1960, reducing take-home pay by more than a third below the regular pay for a 40-hour week.

In November 1960, it was reported that 37,000 steel workers were on such short workweeks that their take-home pay was greatly reduced. Average hours of work in the steel industry fell from 40.9 a week in December 1959, to 36.3 in October 1960.

For a Basic Shorter Week: Under the Fair Labor Standards Act for those engaged in interstate commerce or in production of goods for interstate commerce, the basic workweek was set at 40 hours (beginning in October 1940) with overtime pay for all hours worked over 40 a week. Many unions now believe the time has come to shorten the basic workweek. By February, 1961, there were 20 or more bills in Congress calling for a shorter workweek.

Steelworkers union has urged that a 32-hour week be achieved through legislative action, as one answer to increasing unemployment. The steel industry has reported a permanent loss of 136,000 jobs in the past 7 years. Pres. David J. McDonald stated at the 1960 national convention of the Steelworkers: "Jobs must be found for these people. . . . I firmly believe that the first way to do it is to bring into being the 4-day, 32-hour week." A bill to establish the 32-hour week was introduced in the 87th Congress early in 1961. Rank-and-file steel workers during 1960 held meetings in a number of districts to press for a 30-hour week with 40 hours' pay as part of a job-security program.

A conference on automation held by the N.Y. City Central Labor Council, November 29, 1960, recommended a cut in the workweek as the practical answer to problems of unemployment arising from automation.

The Machinists at their 1960 Grand Lodge convention declared that "the shorter work week shall be made the Number One collective bargaining and legislative objective . . . in the field of working conditions." (*The Machinist*, Sept. 29, 1960.)

Pres. Walter Reuther of the Auto Workers called for "reduction of the standard workweek" in his testimony in August 1960, before a Joint Economic subcommittee of Congress. (*AFL-CIO News*, Aug. 20, 1960.) Locals of the Auto Workers in Michigan in 1960 held a number of meetings and adopted resolutions for a shorter workweek to provide jobs for laid-off workers.

Electrical Workers (UE) at its national convention in September 1960, called upon General Electric and Westinghouse to cut the workweek from 40 to 35 hours with no reduction in pay. UE estimated that 40,000 jobs in GE plants and 20,000 in Westinghouse operations could have been saved if the companies had acceded in 1958 to union demands for a shorter workweek.

Packinghouse Workers at their national convention in 1960 called for a shorter workday, a shorter workweek and longer vacations, with a view to bringing some protection against automation and resulting unemployment.

National Association of Manufacturers announced January 26, 1961, that it would oppose any cut in the workweek, with the argument that a shorter week would not relieve unemployment. Employer organizations as usual oppose any reduction in working hours unless such a cut includes a reduction in weekly wages. For example, the Long Island RR in August 1960, agreed to cut the work week from 6 days to 5 but only with a pay cut for the Trainmen. (See our *Railroad Notes*, Sept. 1960 and our pamphlet, *The Case for the 30-Hour Week*.)

EFFECTS OF AUTOMATION

Further developments in the field of automation during the last few years have resulted in the downgrading of skilled workers to jobs with lower ratings, while only a small proportion of skilled workers have been upgraded to better-paying jobs.

In general, automation and related mechanization has the effect of

reducing the number of production workers, while it increases the jobs available for professional and technical workers. However, this increase, plus some rise in the number of clerical and sales workers, falls far short of making up for the decline in the number of production workers. Between early 1953 and early 1960, factory maintenance and production employment declined 1.5 million, railroad jobs by 400,000, and mining employment by 200,000. (*I.U.D. Digest*, Fall, 1960.)

The over-all effects of automation were outlined by Prof. Charles C. Killingsworth of Michigan State University before a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, June 15, 1960, when he said: "A substantial part of the cost savings from automation usually result from the displacement of labor. Although the result may not be an immediate firing of workers, from the standpoint of society, the net result may well be simply to shift the burden of unemployment from the man who already had a job with the company to the man who doesn't get hired by that company. Or the burden may fall on the man who gets laid off in the next recession and never gets called back."

Dr. Killingsworth also questioned the theory that automation will entail massive upgrading of the labor force and that skills and therefore compensation of the workers will be increased. He says that case studies made to date certainly cast doubt on this notion: "Job requirements have increased in some instances, but usually so little that in-plant training programs of brief duration have met the need." Also, "the man who loses a semi-skilled factory job may end up in a low-skilled service job."

In Specific Industries: Effects of automation have varied from industry to industry. The United Steelworkers estimated that automation wiped out some 10,000 jobs in the steel industry alone in 1959. A steel pipe plant, for example, newly automated is able to turn out four times as much pipe with only one third the number of workers formerly used.

In the automobile industry the index of physical production of cars increased by 4.5% between 1950 and 1959. But in the same period the number of production workers declined by 128,000 or by 18%. Writing on "The Human Side of Automation" in the Spring, 1960, issue of *Business Horizons* (Indiana University), Prof. Walter Buckingham said, "There are about 160,000 unemployed in Detroit who will probably never go back to making automobiles, partly because

the industry is past its peak of growth and partly because automation has taken their jobs."

The Machinists union at its last convention, September, 1960, received a report on automation in the machinery industry, indicating "phenomenal savings" for the companies through the use of new electronic equipment that "masterminded" an entire line of machine tools, making it possible to turn out in a few days orders that had taken weeks to complete with non-automated equipment. This caused displacement of workers and threatened even more to eliminate employment opportunities for young workers in this industry.

The union noted that as a result of automation at the Boeing Airplane Co. in the last 15 years, the ratio of white-collar workers to blue-collar workers changed from approximately 3 to 1 in favor of the blue-collar workers to 3 to 2 in favor of the white-collar workers.

A new automated machine installed in a West Hartford, Conn., factory making fuel pumps for jet aircraft and missiles, it is claimed, has cut direct labor time from about 7 hours to 2 hours, saving 50% on the cost of jigs and fixtures which hold the work, and over 40% on time needed to set up production. It has also replaced from 15 to 20 other machines and the men who operate them.

In baking plants the introduction of one automatic machine reduced the number of man-hours required in one operation from a minimum of 120 to just 2.5. And new automated equipment reduced by 50% the number of workers required on each shift in the bread-baking department while the capacity per shift was increased 75%. In the wrapping department, jobs were cut 75% while there was a 75% increase in capacity.

The use of automation in the telephone industry during the last 5 years has been accompanied by an increase of 23% in average daily phone conversations and a 26% increase in the number of telephones, while employment in the operating end of the industry has declined by 33,000 or 5.5%, Pres. Joseph Beirne of the Communications Workers testified before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in 1960.

In offices also the automated processes have made great headway in displacing workers. A study of office automation in San Francisco showed that for every five office workers eliminated by electronic data processing only one job is created.

In government offices the introduction of automated machinery

has had similar effects on employment. In the Treasury Department alone, it was shown that these installations increased the workload by 14% while employment declined 48%. Number of employees per unit of output was reduced by about 55%.

A preliminary report to President Kennedy in February 1961 by Rep. Elmer J. Holland of the House subcommittee on unemployment and the impact of automation, forecast that machines will eliminate some 4 million office and clerical jobs in the next five years. It stated also that in the last five years electronic machines had already eliminated about 25% of the nation's office and clerical jobs.

A good portion of the "progress" made in reducing the work force on the railroads to present levels, says rail analyst Robert E. Bedingfield, *New York Times* (July 5, 1959) "can be counted as permanent—the fruits of mechanization of maintenance of way, service curtailments, push-button classification yards, centralized traffic control, diesel locomotives, office automation and other changes."

In a special report on the effects of automation, *U.S. News & World Report*, Feb. 6, 1961, noted that, "The U.S. appears to be faced with three choices: (1) put up with a growing amount of joblessness; (2) cut the workweek to spread employment; or (3) find new ways to speed the economy's growth to absorb the hundreds of thousands of new workers who will be seeking jobs every year."

WORK INJURIES AND DEATHS

About 1,970,000 workers in the U.S. were injured in work accidents in 1959, a rise of 8% over 1958 and the highest total since 1953. In 1960, however, there was a slight decline to an estimated 1,960,000.

The injury rate per 1,000 workers showed a similar movement, rising from 29.4 in 1958 to 31.2 in 1959, then declining to 30.5 in 1960.

About 84,200 of the work injuries in 1959 (compared with 75,700 in 1958), and about 83,000 in 1960 resulted in some degree of permanent disablement ranging up to complete inability to engage in further gainful employment.

Number of workers killed in work accidents in 1959 and in 1960 rose to about 13,800 or 4% above the 1958 level but about 600 less than in 1957. The death rate in 1959 and also in 1960 was 22 per 100,000 or about the same as in 1958.

In all, work injuries and deaths resulted in about 41 million man-

days of disability both in 1959 and in 1960. And when the future effects of the deaths and permanent impairments are taken into consideration and added to the loss of time, the total loss from injuries in each year will amount to about 168 million man-days of disability—equal to a year's full time employment of about 540,000 workers.

Mining was the only major industry to show a decrease in fatal and other accidents in 1959, but this was due entirely to lower employment. Coal mining showed the lowest volume of injuries and deaths for any year on record, with employment down 14% in bituminous and 21% in anthracite mines. Metal mining also showed a decrease both in employment and injuries, but other mining operations reported slight increases.

But in 1960, the favorable trend in coal mine accidents was reversed. The 1960 (preliminary) total of 323 men killed in coal mines showed an increase of 31 deaths over the 1959 total of 292.

SOCIAL SECURITY CHANGES

Latest amendments to the Social Security Act were signed by President Eisenhower and became law on September 13, 1960. But they did not include any increase in basic benefits. The few changes include the following provisions.

Disabled workers under age 50 and their dependents can now qualify for benefits on the same basis as workers aged 50-64 and their dependents. Formerly only those over 50 were eligible for such benefits. As a result of this improvement, about 250,000 persons, those disabled and under 50 and certain of their dependents, may qualify for benefits. But to qualify the worker must be "unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity" and must have worked under social security for at least 5 years out of the 10 years before he was disabled.

Changes in 1960 provided for increased benefits for about 400,000 children of deceased workers to give each surviving child benefits equal to three-quarters of the worker's benefits—subject to over-all family limits. About 600,000 retired workers, wives and survivors who had previously been denied benefits because they did not have full coverage, will now be eligible.

Another change allows a retired worker to earn a little more than \$1,200 a year without losing his pension for that period. The amendment provides for "withholding \$1 in benefits for each \$2 of earnings

from \$1,200 to \$1,500 and \$1 in benefits for each \$1 of earnings above \$1,500 . . . No benefits are withheld for any month in which the beneficiary neither earns wages of more than \$100 nor renders substantial services in self-employment." (*Social Security Bulletin*, Nov. 1960)

During the years 1960-62, the tax for old-age, survivors and disability insurance is 6% (3% from employers and 3% from employees) on wages up to \$4,800 a year. Self-employed workers pay 4½% on their net self-employment income.

By October 1960 a total of about 14.6 million retired and disabled workers and survivors were receiving monthly benefits under the Old Age, Survivors and Disability program of the Act. In addition, about 2.4 million were receiving old-age assistance, some 3 million children were receiving benefits under the aid to dependent children program; 108,000 under aid to the blind; and 371,000 permanently and totally disabled were getting aid. The federal government contributes to these four programs which are carried out by local communities, but it does not contribute to "general assistance", consisting of relief for other needy persons. This comes from local governments.

Benefits Static: Despite 1960 amendments to the Social Security Act the average benefits remained at the same meager amounts as before (see *Labor Fact Book* 14), although the cost of living had continued to increase.

For the retired worker, the old-age benefit in October 1960, averaged only \$74.02 or about \$17.20 a week. This amount is obviously not enough to cover expenses of food, rent, electricity and gas, clothing and incidentals. Minimum social security benefit still stands at only \$33 a month for a single retired worker whose monthly earnings have averaged \$50 or less during his working years. This means a retirement income of \$7.66 a week or just over \$1 a day—barely enough for food.

For a retired couple, with the wife starting at age 65, the minimum benefit is \$49.50 or about \$11.50 a week. The benefit for a retired couple rises to a maximum of \$190.50 a month if the worker has earned as much as \$400 a month or \$93 a week.

For many retired workers the social security benefit has been so inadequate that they have been forced to accept public assistance, variously called "relief", "welfare" or "general assistance."

Budget for a Retired Couple: The U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics announced November 23, 1960, that a retired man and wife, 65 years of age or older, needed from \$220 to \$280 in monthly income for

a "modest but adequate level of living." Pricing cost-of-living items in 20 cities, it found that yearly costs for such a couple ranged from \$2,641 in Houston, to \$3,044 in New York City, and \$3,366 in Chicago. After this survey was made in 1959, living costs continued to rise during 1960 by about 1.5%.

This new living standard, the Bureau stated, "is not a luxurious level, but one adequate to provide more than the basic essentials of consumption." It may be contrasted with social security payments to a retired couple over 65 which averaged in 1960 about \$123 a month—less than half the average budgetary needs. Since this leaves a deficit of \$100 or more a month, the BLS explained that, "A more-than-subsistence-living level generally presumes some outside income, such as private pensions or yield from investments."

The budget is said to represent "a level of living which provides the goods and services necessary for a healthful, self-respecting mode of living, and allows normal participation in community life according to standards prevailing in large cities or their suburbs in the U. S."

In New York City, this retired couple's budget allows about \$18 a week for food and beverages; over \$16 a week (about \$70 a month) for rent, heat and utilities; and about \$24 a week (nearly \$105 a month) for all other expenses. This last category includes a long list of necessities: transportation, clothing, household furnishings, medical care, personal care, household operation, reading, recreation, tobacco, gifts, contributions and miscellaneous expenses. For medical care in New York, the budget allows about 9% of the total—about \$274 a year, or an average of about \$23 a month. The amount for rent, at \$70 a month, assumes that the couple will live in a rented apartment of 2 to 3 rooms.

A retired couple trying to live on an average monthly Social Security benefit of \$123 a month for the two (less than \$30 a week) would have no more than half the amount needed to meet this "modest" budget. Even those receiving the maximum benefit of \$190.50 (for a couple) would still not be able to reach the budget level.

If the husband dies, the widow must somehow subsist on one-half of the social security benefit they had together. Thus, if their joint benefit had been \$126 a month, hers alone will be only \$63.

Labor Proposals: The AFL-CIO at its 1959 convention stated that payments under the Social Security Act are "wholly inadequate to provide minimum requirements due to the rise in the cost of living since benefit payments were last revised". It called for lowering the age re-

tirement to 60 for men and 55 years for women; participation in payment and benefits by all who work for wages as well as self-employed. It urged that next of kin benefits be provided where a single person dies and there is no surviving parent.

EXTENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Full-time unemployment, as officially estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, was slightly over 5.7 million in February 1961, higher than at any time since before the nation entered World War II.

In the previous two years, the ranks of the jobless continued to increase both in absolute numbers and as a percent of the labor force. Unemployment had stayed above the 3.2 million low-point reached in September 1959, which, in turn, was considerably higher than the low-point of 2.5 million for the years 1957 and 1958 and of 2.1 million for 1955 and 1956.

From the end of 1958 through February 1961, a total of 26 months, the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment, as revised by the BLS in February, 1961, was equal to or greater than 5% in every single month except one, February 1960, when it fell to 4.8%. The unemployment rate, in contrast, had been greater than 5% in 14 of the 24 months of the years 1957-58 but not so large in any one of the months of the years 1955-6.

The Labor Research Association Unemployment Index, developed since the publication of *Labor Fact Book* 14, gives additional evidence of the growing problem. Using as a base period the years 1947-49, a period characterized by both boom and recession, the LRA index measures the percentage growth of full-time unemployment since then. In February 1961, the index stood at 204.7, showing that full-time unemployment had more than doubled since the years 1947-9.

Since the beginning of 1959, full-time unemployment has always been at least 16% above the 1947-9 level. In the years 1957-8, in contrast, it had dropped to as low as 10% below and in 1955-6 to as low as 25% below that level.

Estimating the Number: Congressional investigations have again raised serious questions about the adequacy of the unemployment count. Sen. Paul Douglas, for example, says the government has been understating the full extent of unemployment. Such criticism has echoed to some extent that made earlier by the Electrical Workers (UE) and the Long-

shoremen & Warehousemen (Ind.). Some of the major points made by witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee and other congressional committees were:

1. The government figure on unemployment is derived by subtracting from the labor force total the number of employed workers. The labor force is defined as consisting of those people who have jobs plus those without jobs who are actively seeking work. Many people like housewives, full-time students and retired persons are, by definition, excluded from the labor force.

The size of the labor force fluctuates from month to month and from season to season. In June it usually grows as students leave their classrooms and hunt for summer jobs. In September, it falls as they go back to school. This type of fluctuation is quite normal and does not cause much concern to the critics of the official estimates.

The government's labor force figures, however, also fluctuate with the business cycle. They grow much faster in periods of boom than in recession periods. The government explains this away by saying that in a boom many housewives, students, and retired people seek work while in a recession they do not. Thus, these very same people whom the government statisticians put in the labor force when they have jobs are taken out of it when they lose their jobs, and so not considered unemployed. Since these people would have been working if jobs were available, their exclusion from the labor force hides the full extent of unemployment.

2. The survey methods skip large numbers of unemployed. Every month the government interviews approximately 35,000 households in 330 counties and independent cities, out of over 3,100 such in the country. The interviewers thus miss many areas though they cover the most populous ones. Some of these areas not included are depressed regions where unemployment is much higher than in those covered. Many unemployed are thus never counted.

3. The questioning methods make it difficult to uncover the full extent of unemployment. The government considers a man unemployed if he is without a job and is actively seeking work. He is also considered unemployed if he is not actively seeking work because there is no work available. The government interviewer always asks a jobless person if he had looked for work during the previous week. If the reply is "Yes," the interviewer automatically classifies him as unemployed; if "No," the interviewer classifies him as "not in the labor force"—that is, he is

not considered unemployed—unless he volunteers the information that no work is available. The interviewer is instructed not to ask the worker why he was not looking for work. The government insists that this information must come, without prodding, from the workers themselves.

Since many people are normally reticent about giving too much information to government officials, they will not volunteer this information unless asked. This method of questioning, thus, hides a great deal of unemployment, especially in distressed areas where many people do not look for work because none is available.

4. The government makes no allowance for part-time employment. It considers everyone employed who has worked at least one hour for pay in the week of the survey. This concept classifies a worker as employed even if he is laid off after several hours work on the first day of the survey week. It also does not measure the amount of unemployment resulting from shorter workweeks.

Many employers today prefer to cut working hours rather than to resort to mass layoffs, because their payroll taxes for the unemployment compensation fund are based on the number of claims against the fund. The more workers they furlough, the higher the claims, and the greater the taxes.

Since cutting working hours is much more prevalent today than in the Thirties, when employers did not have to worry about unemployment compensation claims, the exclusion of part-time workers from the unemployment count seriously understates the full extent of idleness.

The government reported for instance, that 2,771,000 workers were on short-weeks for economic reasons in December, 1960. Sen. Douglas conservatively estimated these to be equivalent to 1,171,000 full-time unemployed. The government reported the number of full-time unemployed for that month at 4,540,000. By adding the full-time equivalent of the part-time employed to the full-time figure, Douglas estimated unemployment at 5,711,000, or 25% above the government's figure.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Among the 5.7 million unemployed in February 1961, about 1,600,000 had been out of work 15 weeks or longer. At least 675,000 had been jobless for 6 months or more. It was estimated that by April some 720,000 would have exhausted their unemployment benefits. Number drawing

jobless benefits in February totaled over 3.4 million, or a million more than a year before, and representing an unemployment rate of over 8% among workers insured for state jobless benefits.

There is still no federal provision for jobless insurance and the 50 states in the U. S. each have their own compensation law, resulting in a hodge-podge of state standards. Only about 60% of all workers are covered by government unemployment insurance of any kind.

As originally planned the standard for unemployment compensation called for benefits equal to two-thirds of a state's average wages but no state has yet passed legislation to meet that standard. And only 14 states provide even for a maximum benefit up to 50% of the state's average wage.

Despite some small improvements in unemployment insurance provisions in a number of states, the amounts actually paid in jobless benefits remain appallingly low. For the country as a whole, the weekly payment averaged \$33.73, only a little more than a third of the factory workers' average weekly wage which was \$91.08 in that month.

In only 5 states (Kansas, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, Wyoming) maximum jobless benefits increased during 1960, since the amount had been set as a percentage of average weekly wages. Wisconsin thus had 2 automatic increases and each of the other 4 states had at least one such increase.

Duration of Benefits: Length of time during which benefits are paid to the jobless vary widely from state to state, the average being estimated at about 12 weeks. Only 30 state laws provide for a maximum of 26 weeks, and 6 of these (California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, North Carolina, Vermont) will pay up to 39 weeks during a "business recession." In these 6 states, the temporarily extended duration depends on a "triggered" extension, according to a certain level of unemployment. If the point is set relatively high then the state legislature can avoid special action. California was the only state in 1960 to extend jobless benefits on this basis, although unemployment was also serious in the other 5 states in this group.

While the provision for a maximum of 26 weeks duration sounds well on paper, qualifications are such that in only 11 states can 85% or more of eligible jobless qualify for at least 26 weeks if they need it. At the other extreme are 20 states where large numbers of the unemployed cannot qualify for more than 15 weeks. As the result of all these restrictions there are only 13 states that now have an actual average

duration of 26 weeks or more. Pennsylvania still leads with an average of 30 weeks.

The phrase "long-term unemployment" is generally used to describe those who have been jobless 6 months or more in a year. At an AFL-CIO conference in Washington in December 1960, it was reported that "long-term unemployment has become a prominent and persistent feature of our creeping, slow growth economy." Among the long-term jobless are those branded by employers as too old to work (can be anybody over 40); large numbers of Negroes; workers whose training and skills are obsolete or whose customary work has been automated out of existence; and tens of thousands who live in depressed areas out of work regardless of cyclical recessions.

Supplementary Unemployment Benefits (SUB): More than 2 million workers, in about 30 unions, have had some small protection against the hazards of unemployment under plans won by collective bargaining and known as supplemental unemployment benefits (SUB). Steelworkers union has by far the largest number covered by such plans first negotiated in 1956. Other unions with many so covered include Auto Workers, Machinists, Electrical Workers (IBEW), Rubber Workers, Aluminum Workers, Plumbers & Pipe Fitters, and Brick & Clay Workers.

Rubber Workers by 1960 had 130,000 members covered by SUB plans in agreements with 104 companies. About 10% of those covered have received benefits from funds maintained by employers at a cost of 3c per man-hour worked.

Companies accepting such plans have agreed to pay their laid-off workers weekly amounts to supplement state jobless benefits. Generally the amount guaranteed is to bring the total, including the state insurance, up to 65% of the worker's after-tax, straight-time weekly wage for 4 weeks and then up to 60% for remaining weeks while he is still entitled to state benefits. These supplementary amounts have ranged from a minimum of \$2 up to a maximum of \$25 a week. In some plans the SUB payments have continued even after state benefits have been exhausted, to make up at least part of the lost income. But SUB payments under most plans can continue only as long as 52 weeks.

As the economic recession developed in 1960, supplementary unemployment benefits were reduced by many companies. In the steel industry, for example, U. S. Steel and 8 other large companies in December 1960, cut their SUB payments by 25% or more. By February 1961, some

17 steel companies had reduced payments to their laid-off workers.

Improvements Proposed: President Kennedy proposed and Congress passed in early 1961, a bill to extend temporarily the duration of jobless benefits up to a maximum increase of 13 weeks.

More specific and far-reaching were proposals of AFL-CIO at its 1959 national convention. It resolved to support "a comprehensive overhauling and improvement of the unemployment insurance system under a single federal system. Pending such a reorganization, we support federal legislation providing uniform minimum standards for benefits, duration, eligibility, disqualifications. . . . Federal legislation should also provide reinsurance as a source of grants-in-aid to states and permit states to make flat-rate reduction in taxes."

AFL-CIO affirmed as a principle "The basic maximum weekly benefit must be established at about two-thirds of the states' average weekly wages in covered employment in order to allow the wage replacement principle to operate for most covered employees. . . . All claimants who establish their attachment to the labor force and maintain their eligibility should be entitled to 39 weeks of benefits if they cannot find employment in that time."

The labor federation also called for efforts at both federal and state levels to abolish the waiting week; eliminate harsh, restrictive and arbitrary provisions in regard to eligibility and disqualifications; extend benefits to all wage and salary employees; and to improve the financing of benefit costs.

DEPRESSED AREAS

A depressed area is identified by the U. S. Department of Labor as one in which unemployment represents 6% or more of the total work force, but also has had an annual average at least 50% above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 years, or at least 75% above for 2 of the preceding 3 years, or at least 100% above for 1 of the preceding 2 years. Some of these areas of "substantial and persistent" unemployment have more than doubled the national average for a number of years.

In Welch, West Va., for example, 28% of the work force was unemployed in January 1961, while in Uniontown, Pa., the rate was 23%. West Virginia as a whole had 15% of its labor force out of work. The national average at that time was 7.7%.

The Labor Department in March listed 103 of these nonrural "areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus." (*Area Labor Market Trends*, Jan. 1961.) Sen. Paul H. Douglas in his report on "economically distressed areas," January 1, 1961, estimated that the major areas of chronic joblessness, plus smaller areas covered in his bill in Congress, were inhabited by 20 to 25 million persons. The lowest income rural and small urban areas alone numbered around 350 at that time.

The Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems of the U. S. Senate, headed by Sen. Eugene J. McCarthy (D., Minn.), had held hearings between October 5, 1959 and January 11, 1960 in 12 states and the District of Columbia. Its report, March 30, 1960, included a chapter on distressed areas, with recommendations for assistance.

Use of gas and oil rather than coal for heating and railroad power, and mechanization of mining operations have resulted in serious, long-term unemployment in large areas of Indiana, Illinois, Wyoming, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia and other communities along the Appalachian Range. Communities that have suffered most because of this change include the Pennsylvania anthracite mining areas of Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazelton and Pottsville where chronic heavy unemployment has continued for many years.

Coal Regions: In Scranton, the idle coal breakers and collieries tell the story of unemployment and stranded miners. More than 10% of the work force was idle in this area in 1960—double the national rate. The anthracite industry, which formerly employed 136,000 in 2 counties, was down to 8,000, "with no prospect that it will ever revive." (*N. Y. Times*, Oct. 28, 1960.) Most of the new jobs available in the area were for women and the average factory wage in this field was 50c an hour below the national level. In Hazelton, the Senate committee reported that "3,000 new jobs had been created as a result of community efforts, yet unemployment in 1959 was estimated to be 16% of the area labor force."

The committee heard a county school superintendent in West Virginia testify that 120 out of 290 children in one school came from homes in which no wage-earner was employed: "Quite often children come to school without breakfast because there is no food in the house. . . . Much of the teachers' time is spent in trying to supply the children with necessities."

When President-elect Kennedy in December 1960, appointed a national committee, headed by Senator Douglas, to study and report on

depressed areas, he called attention to West Virginia as the state hardest hit by technological change and subsequent chronic unemployment. In some mining areas in this state employment has declined by two-thirds since 1947. In Kanawha County, for example, machine cutters and loaders have reduced mine employment from 7,470 men in 1948 to 2,400 in 1960.

Textile and Other Areas: Many northern communities have been left isolated when runaway plants moved South to other areas. The "re-location" of the textile industry, for example, has left behind it deserted plants and jobless workers in such areas as Fall River, Lawrence-Haverhill, Lowell and New Bedford in Massachusetts and the Providence-Pawtucket region in Rhode Island.

Vice-President William Du Chessi of the Textile Workers testified in January 1960 at Senate committee hearings that there was a 40% reduction in textile employment in Gloversville, N. Y.

"But the figures," he added, "cannot tell the full story of the personal tragedies involved, the desperation of workers who see the mills shut down after a long life of service, without so much as severance pay, and where they search for jobs where there are no jobs, and they exhaust their unemployment benefits and their personal savings. Dependence on private and public charity and above all a sense of hopelessness, begin to overcome the individual after many months of enforced idleness. The pride of these people cries out for a solution."

Congressional Recommendations: After extensive hearings on distressed, depressed areas the Senate committee reported: "Postwar experience has demonstrated that existing local, state, and federal programs are inadequate to deal with the serious problem of chronic unemployment and underemployment. The committee received convincing testimony that communities subject to chronic unemployment cannot solve their problems alone. Most local leaders of business and labor agreed on the need for federal action to assist distressed areas."

The committee recommended that: (a) highest priority be given to the enactment of an effective area redevelopment program; (b) a coal research and development agency be established as a step toward restoration of a strong economy in the coal regions of the nation; (c) a tax program be developed to provide concessions to plants locating or expanding in distressed areas; (d) federal agencies concerned with programs affecting forests, water resources, roads and community facilities give special attention to the needs of distressed areas to help restore

their capacity for achieving economic health.

At its 1959 convention, the AFL-CIO, in a resolution on depressed areas and industrial migration, called upon the federal government to initiate "a comprehensive program of technical aid, public contract priorities, low interest loans for new and expanding private enterprises, public works loans and grants, vocational retraining, and supplementary compensation for displaced workers during the retraining period." It said that the Area Redevelopment Act met the minimum requirements for an effective federal effort to alleviate local area distress. But on May 13, 1960, President Eisenhower vetoed this bill and Congress sustained his veto.

Senator Douglas in his report on distressed areas in January 1961, called for a program on four main fronts to: 1. double the distribution of surplus food to needy families; 2. extend unemployment compensation for those who have exhausted their benefits; 3. provide over \$300 million in grants and loans to build new plants; 4. develop localized public works to create jobs.

POVERTY IN "AFFLUENT" AMERICA

Not only in areas generally recognized as depressed and distressed, but also among migrant workers (see below) and minority groups such as Negroes and Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and American Indians in the U. S., poverty holds countless thousands in its grip. The *Wall Street Journal* (June 17, 1959) quotes a big-city politician describing New York City: "Remember, this city is just a big cake of poverty with a Park Avenue frosting."

Public and General Assistance: Nearly 7 million persons, or about 4% of the U. S. population, have in 1959-60 been receiving some form of public assistance as defined above in the discussion of social security. These payments, meager as they are in most cases, now total about \$3.7 billion a year with the federal government paying about half and state and local governments the remainder.

The "general assistance" part of the public assistance covered in August 1960, some 360,000 persons. It is paid for entirely by the state or local governments. It naturally increases in periods of rising unemployment when large numbers of jobless exhaust their state unemployment

ment compensation payments. If these payments, as well as social security benefits, were increased and coverage extended there would of course be fewer persons forced on relief rolls in periods of chronic slump and protracted unemployment.

In addition to those receiving public assistance and general assistance there were hundreds of thousands receiving aid from privately-supported religious and other charity organizations in all cities and in many smaller communities.

In a special article on relief rolls, the *New York Times*, May 3, 1959, showed that under the general assistance programs of the various states, "standards, eligibility and benefit amounts can and do differ widely. In some localities it is at least theoretically possible for a family to starve." At best, public assistance provides only for a minimum level of subsistence.

12% Ill-Nourished: After a special nationwide survey of food consumption by households in this country in a particular week in 1955, the U. S. Department of Agriculture reported that 12% of all households in that year had less food energy than the standard required for a good diet. (*Dietary Levels of Households in the U. S.*, p. 30.) This would mean that in as many as 6.6 million households, including about 17 million persons, the diet was not up to the recommended level. This survey by the Department was the basis for the statement by John F. Kennedy before he became President that 17 million Americans are hungry.

A larger number of low-income households were below the "good diet" level than the households having higher incomes. Among households with less than \$2,000 a year in income, 14% were below the food energy standard. But among households having from \$4,000 to \$5,000 income, only 9% were below that standard.

Surplus Food Distribution: By January 1961, about 6.1 million "needy persons" were receiving free surplus food, the U. S. Department of Agriculture reported. During 1960, the surplus food from the federal government went to the largest numbers in the following states: Pennsylvania, 391,435 persons; West Virginia, 235,957; Kentucky, 211,387; Michigan, 198,617; Mississippi, 195,159; Oklahoma, 177,232; Arkansas, 153,441; Louisiana, 114,781; and Alabama, 110,891.

President Kennedy on March 8, 1961, stated that the number of people receiving surplus food had doubled, from 3.5 million in December to 6.1 million in March. The retail value of the food being distributed

monthly had doubled from \$12.80 to \$24.40 for a family of four.

Migrant Workers: Among the poorest and most exploited groups in the U. S. are some 500,000 migrant workers and their families who harvest much of the nation's food. The U. S. Senate subcommittee on migratory labor reported in November 1960, that the migrant and his family together earn about \$900 a year, on the average, or about \$17.30 a week for 52 weeks.

The migrant "lives a life that is characterized by 'exclusion'," the committee pointed out. He and his family are stateless, rightless and voteless. Most federal social and labor legislation contains specific exemptions for farm labor. And most state and county social, labor and welfare laws provide either that non-residents shall be ineligible or, like federal laws, exempt farm labor. Thus migrants are generally excluded from social security, unemployment insurance, fair labor standards and labor relations laws.

In its introduction to *The Migrant Farm Worker in America*, the Senate subcommittee noted: "Behind the screen of statistics showing migrant labor toiling for as little as 50c an hour and working only 131 days a year, we see families crowded into shelters that are more like coops for animals, with children undernourished and in poor health, 2 or 3 years behind in school, with little chance to develop their talents and become useful to themselves or their country. This is the ugliest kind of human waste. The plight of the migrant and his family is a charge on the conscience of all of us."

Describing the housing in many farm labor camps, *The New York Times* (Aug. 29, 1960) said: "Some of the camps are squalid clusters of tar paper shacks. . . . Large families are crowded into a single cubicle. . . . They lack electricity, screens or garbage can lids, and have, in place of plumbing, a hand pump out front and a couple of privies out back."

On child labor in the fields, *Good Housekeeping* noted: The children "picked in silence, with intense concentration. They stopped, crawled and stretched, taking no time for rest or chatter." Some of these children were as young as seven.

In an article on the strike of California farm workers in 1960, *Facts for Farmers* (Sept. 1960), published by Farm Research, reported that the Joint U. S.-Mexico Trade Union Committee had demanded a \$1 hourly minimum wage for Mexican contract farm labor in place of the present 50c minimum. In Texas and other places, the minimum at times drops to 40c or less.

ECONOMIC SITUATION OF NEGRO WORKERS

Nationally, the Negro population in 1960 was 18,871,380, the Census Bureau reported. Only 52% of the Negroes in 1960 lived in the 11 southern states, as compared with 60% in 1950. Roughly one-third of all Negroes are in northern and western cities. The Census Bureau reported in 1959 on "the exodus of Negroes from sharecropping and other small-scale farming, where, more than in other types of enterprise, the very young and the very old tend to be at work."

In the civilian labor force are some 7.5 million nonwhite men and women of whom about 7.2 million are Negroes—some 4.4 million men and 2.8 million women. Of the total nonwhite population of 14 years of age and over, almost 62% were in the labor force in 1959, compared with 57% of the whites of the same age. (U. S. Department of Labor, *The Economic Situation of Negroes in the U. S.*)

More Jobless: Unemployment rate is generally higher among nonwhites than among white workers. It has been about double the white rate in recent years. In 1959, the average rate of unemployed was 4.6% of the labor force for white men but 11.5% for nonwhite men. For women, the jobless rate was 5.3% for whites but 9.5% for nonwhites.

In January, 1961, the average rate of jobless whites was reported as 7% of the labor force, while the rate for Negroes was 13.8%. Secretary of Labor Goldberg reported that "the jobless rate of Negroes was the highest in the nation." (*N. Y. Times*, Feb. 18, 1961.)

In 12 of the nation's largest cities unemployment of Negroes was three times the general rate, the National Urban League reported in March, 1961, after a special survey of 50 cities. In Philadelphia in early 1961, the general rate of unemployment was 7% while the rate for Negro workers was 28%. In Cleveland and St. Louis, 20% of the Negro labor force were jobless; in Pittsburgh, 24%; Detroit 39%; Fort Wayne, Indiana, 44%.

Occupations: Changes between 1940 and 1960 have resulted in giving Negro workers somewhat more of the semi-skilled factory operative jobs. The proportion of Negro men on such jobs rose from 6.1% in 1940 to 11.6% of all men so employed in 1960, but only 9% of Negro men were skilled craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers as against 20% of white men. Negro women classified as operatives rose from 5% to 12.4% of all women so employed in 1960, but less than 6% of all women professional and technical workers were Negroes.

Even in New York, one of the more progressive states in recognizing Negro job rights, they have little or no opportunity for apprenticeship training for more skilled jobs. The N. Y. State Commission Against Discrimination (SCAD) reported in January 1961, that their efforts to get Negro youths accepted in apprenticeship programs, particularly those of labor unions, had met with very slight success. Progress was "painfully slow."

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in a special study. *The Negro Wage-Earner and Apprenticeship Training Programs*, points out: "Underlying the absence of Negroes in significant numbers from skilled-craft employment is their almost total exclusion from apprenticeship training programs." For many years, a large number of unions have opposed such training for Negro workers. Such training "for Negroes, both formal and informal, did not fall into disuse until craft unions and other interests erected a color bar for many skilled-craft occupations."

In the railroad industry, for example, it was found that out of 70,860 locomotive engineers only 60 were Negroes. This is a small fraction (less than one-tenth of 1%) of the total number employed. Among locomotive firemen the situation is a little better. Out of 53,310 firemen employed, 2,100 or 3.93% are Negroes. In most other skilled-craft occupations, Negro workers represent similar low percentages.

In government employment, however, there has been some progress. The number of Negroes working in federal, state and local government jobs registered a 4-fold increase between 1940 and 1960. President Kennedy on March 6, 1961 issued an executive order setting up the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity which replaced two former committees on government employment and contracts. The new committee has broad powers to investigate and enforce regulations against job discrimination by the U. S. government and contractors. If it is really enforced it can open new job opportunities for Negroes.

The National Urban League reported in January 1961, that the first Negro plumber's apprentice in New York City was hired in October 1960, after months of negotiations between the N. Y. Urban League and the Plumbers union. The first Negro electrician went to work in 1960 on a public building under construction in Washington, D. C. The League is "continuing its long struggle for fair seniority practices which would up-grade great numbers of Negro workmen out of bottom-rung jobs where layoffs are most common."

Wages Are Lower: The fact that Negroes are still generally working in the less skilled jobs is reflected in their earnings, as reported by the Census Bureau. The median wage or salary income of year-round, full-time workers in 1959 was \$2,844 for Negro men or about 58% of the white men workers' median of \$4,902.

PUERTO RICANS IN THE U. S.

About 945,000 Puerto Ricans now live in continental U. S., about 720,000 of them in New York City. Some 50,000 live in northern New Jersey, while 35,000 are in Chicago and 25,000 in Philadelphia. Of those in N. Y. City some 300,000 are packed into little more than a square mile of Spanish Harlem on the upper east side of Manhattan. The most dynamic growth in New York City has been among the Puerto Rican people. Between 1950 and 1957 they increased by 345,000 or 140%—about three-fifths of them coming by migration from the Island and two-fifths by natural growth among those already here.

In a recent survey, *Island in the City: Puerto Ricans in New York*, Dan Wakefield describes the East Harlem area with its slums which breed disease and misery for thousands who must live there because they cannot afford anything better.

Many apartment houses in New York City, built before 1901, are officially known as "old-law tenements", and there are still some 50,000 such buildings, housing some 400,000 families, mostly Negro and Puerto Rican. In Spanish Harlem, considered one of the nation's worst slums, the people live in its roach-ridden rooms for which they must pay three times the price of a room south of this area.

A survey by the N. Y. City Dept. of Welfare of rents of families on relief and living in private housing, found that Puerto Ricans paid a median rent of \$55 a month compared with \$46 by nonwhites (mostly Negroes) and only \$37 by whites. ("The Puerto Ricans in New York City," in *Housing and Minority Groups* by N. Glaser and David McEntire. University of Calif. Press, 1960.)

The Puerto Ricans, with much lower incomes, thus paid the highest rents while the whites, with much higher incomes, paid the lowest. Another survey of 800 Puerto Rican households in 3 boroughs of N. Y. City found that the median annual income was only \$2,691 compared with \$5,478 for all N. Y. City families. And these Puerto Rican families paid

a median monthly rent of \$52.80 or almost a fourth of their income, far above the average rent-income ratio of other tenants.

Other studies found that wages of Puerto Rican workers were only about 80% of Negro wages and a little more than half those of whites. Employers of Puerto Rican workers are sometimes haled into court for paying less than the minimum wage of \$1 an hour.

Despite all their economic and social handicaps, an increasing number of Puerto Ricans have been able to educate themselves for more skilled occupations such as physicians and lawyers. More are getting jobs as teachers, office workers and clerks.

About one-third of all Puerto Rican workers in New York City are members of trade unions. Some 50,000 belong to the Ladies Garment Workers' Union, representing a tenth of its membership, but they have little or no power in the union. About one-fifth of restaurant and hotel workers in Manhattan are Puerto Ricans and many are active in the Hotel & Restaurant Workers Union. Many were on the picketlines in the 1959 strike of hospital workers led by the Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Workers, Local 1199. Maritime unions have about 15,000 Puerto Rican members.

Other unions having substantial numbers of Puerto Rican members in New York City include Building Service Employees, with some 10,000; Bakery & Confectionery Workers with about 6,000; Laundry Workers, 6,000; and Amalgamated Clothing Workers, 4,000.

In a new study, *Strangers—Then Neighbors*, Dr. Clarence Senior, consultant to the Puerto Rican Secretary of Labor, noted the increasing employment of Puerto Ricans in key industries. He pointed out that the Puerto Rican has adjusted to American city life faster than any previous newcomer. (See also *Up From Puerto Rico*, by Dr. Elena Padilla; and *The Puerto Rican Journey: New York's Newest Migrants*, by C. Wright Mills, Clarence Senior and Rose Kohn Golden.)

WOMEN WORKERS

Of every three persons in the labor force in this country in 1960, one was a woman. The proportion of women in the total number has risen steadily, from 22% in 1930, 25% in 1940, 28.5% in 1950, 30% in 1955, to 32% in 1959. By 1960 women workers numbered nearly 24 million, the U.S. Women's Bureau reported, compared with 19 million in

1950. In that decade women accounted for 8 in every 10 million workers added to the labor force. (1960 *Handbook on Women Workers*.)

Some 12.5 million, or more than half of all women workers are married. Of these married women 6.5 million have children under 18, while at least 2.5 million have children under six, i.e. under school age. These figures include only married women living with their husbands. In addition to these there are 5 million women workers who are widowed or divorced or not living with their husbands, and more than a million of these have children under 18. Working mothers with young children have special problems not easily solved.

In more than a quarter of all married couples in the U.S., both husband and wife are working, and the main reason why both work in so many cases is clearly economic need. A study by the U.S. Department of Labor in 1959 found that when the husband earned more than \$5,000 a year the proportion of wives in the labor force declined, reaching a low point of 15% among women with husbands having incomes of \$10,000 or more.

Part-time is more common among women workers than among men. About one-fourth of all women workers are employed less than 35 hours a week, while only about one-tenth of men workers have such part-time jobs.

Wage Differential: In terms of wages or salary, half of all women workers in 1959 earned less than \$1,527, the median, while for men the median was \$4,209. In that year, 74% of the women or about three out of every 4 earned less than \$3,000, while only 34% of men were below \$3,000.

Among those working full time throughout the year earnings are higher for both men and women, but the differential is just as great. The median for women year-round full-time workers in 1959 was \$3,193, only about 60% of the men's median which was \$5,209. (Bureau of the Census, *Consumer Income*, Jan. 5, 1961.)

The main reason why women earn less, the Department of Labor explains, "is because of the kinds of jobs that women are able to get. You usually find them employed in fields where the pay is less for both men and women." (*American Workers Fact Book*, 1960, p. 101.)

N. Y. State Department of Labor reports on average weekly earnings of women separately from those of men, so that the differential becomes startlingly clear. In June, 1960, for example, women factory

workers in N.Y. State averaged \$60.92 a week, or 41% less than the men who averaged \$103.90.

In each of the 21 manufacturing industry groups listed for N.Y. State the differential was marked—in some cases less than the average for all together and in some cases more. In the apparel industry (men's and women's clothing), for example, women workers averaged \$55.80 while men averaged \$98.84, a difference of about 43%.

Equal Pay for Equal Work: "Some employers pay a lower rate to women than to men doing similar work," the U.S. Department of Labor points out and adds: "This practice is inconsistent with the principle of equal pay, which means payment on the rate for the job, regardless of sex."

By 1960, equal pay laws were in effect in 20 states, as follows: Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington, Wyoming. However, Congress has not yet passed federal equal-pay legislation.

Illinois and Michigan limit equal-pay coverage to manufacturing. In some states agricultural workers, domestic workers and workers employed by non-profit organizations are exempt from the equal-pay law. Laws requiring that men and women school teachers be paid the same salary for comparable teaching services are in effect in 16 states and the District of Columbia.

SCHOOL SYSTEM SHORTAGES

Construction of local schools in the U.S. during the past two years has lagged still further behind the classroom needs. The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported in October, 1960, a shortage of 142,100 classrooms, an increase of 6,900 over the shortage of 135,200 in 1959. The total of 142,100 includes 66,000 needed to end overcrowding and 75,000 to replace unsatisfactory facilities.

One school building in every five was reported by the U.S. Office of Education in 1960 as a potential firetrap. Another one in every five was a borderline case. Yet in the face of such need, construction of school buildings declined by 2.9% in 1959 and by about 10% in 1960. The 1959 drop was the first decline in classroom construction since 1946.

The excess of pupils above normal classroom capacity totaled 1,868,000 in 1960 an increase of 122,000 over 1959, while about 685,000 pupils in 36 states were attending school on curtailed or half-day sessions.

In his message to Congress on school aid, February 20, 1961, President Kennedy pointed out that "an average net gain of one million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already strained by well over a half million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions. . . . If every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed in the next 10 years. . . . We must give attention to both teachers' salaries and classrooms."

Teachers Needed: Public schools in 1960 were short an estimated total of 135,000 qualified teachers. Because of this lack, schools were compelled to employ about 94,000 emergency teachers—that is, teachers who held substandard or temporary licenses. The National Education Association commented on the teacher situation:

"The mere number of teachers with emergency credentials [a ratio of 1 of every 14 public school teachers in the nation] understates the broader problem of the teacher shortage. It does not show the number of unfilled positions, the number teaching in fields for which they are not fully prepared, nor the number of teachers needed to reduce class size and teacher workload. Neither does it show the numbers needed to expand services such as counseling, libraries and testing." Despite the teacher shortage, however, efforts were made in various states in 1960 to raise the standards of new teachers.

The NEA report for 1960 showed that actually 230,000 more teachers were needed, primarily because of the large numbers required to replace those leaving the profession. About 95,000 graduates in 1960 entered teaching fields thus leaving the estimated shortage of 135,000.

One reason for the continuing shortage in the number of teachers was indicated by the NEA report, May 28, 1960, showing that the average salary of teachers was less than half the average earnings of 17 other professions requiring a college education. Teachers holding college degrees averaged \$5,059, while the average earnings of the 17 other professions were \$10,697. In teaching, the average earnings of men were \$5,780 and of women, \$4,689. "Women college graduates were earning much less if they were teachers than if they were in the other professions," the NEA report showed.

The NEA report quoted the Heller committee budget for the

family of a salaried junior professional and executive worker as providing for the minimum needs of a teacher. This budget called for \$9,816 as of September 1960. (See Family Budgets.)

HOUSING CONDITIONS

The 1960 Census revealed that, despite a considerable improvement in the quality of housing since 1960, almost 16 million dwelling units, more than 25% of the nation's housing stock, were still substandard. In 1950, some 17 million units had been substandard, or about 37% of the housing stock.

Most of the improvement in this decade was centered in owner-occupied homes. Apartments and homes occupied by renters did not fare so well. While only 38% of all dwelling units were occupied by renters, more than half of all substandard units were inhabited by them.

Among white families, home ownership was more common than among nonwhites. More than half of the whites owned their homes while only two-fifths of the nonwhites.

Nonwhites occupied 5.2 million dwelling units, about 9% of all dwelling units. Approximately 2.9 million or 57% of these units were substandard. Nonwhites lived in about 19% of the nation's substandard units.

These Census figures actually understate the inadequate housing conditions which minority and low-income families face. These data are based on the physical conditions of the buildings and on the quality of plumbing facilities. They do not measure overcrowding. There are thus many buildings which the Census considers sound from a physical point of view but which are unsound from a social point of view.

In New York City, for example, many old mansions, which were well built, have been broken up into small apartments. While these buildings do contain adequate plumbing facilities, they also contain far too many people for adequate health and safety standards. The Census lists these buildings either as "sound" or "deteriorating." Those which are listed as "sound" are not included among the substandard dwellings.

Dr. Frank S. Horne, executive director of the New York City Commission on Intergroup Relations, revealed the extent of this overcrowding when he told the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in

1959: "If the population density in some of Harlem's worst blocks were translated in larger terms, we could fit the entire population of the United States into three of this city's five boroughs."

The severe shortage of housing, with resultant high rents and discrimination, are responsible for this overcrowding. Negroes who do have the money to buy homes or move into less crowded neighborhoods are barred from doing so by the discriminatory practices of real estate agents, banks and local neighborhood "improvement" councils. The Commission on Civil Rights found that of the 737,000 new homes built by private interests in the New York Metropolitan area between 1950 and 1956 only 12,000, or less than 2%, were occupied by non-whites.

Discrimination in New York is so widespread that even African and Asian delegates to the United Nations have had difficulty finding homes. The *New York Times* reported the United Nations was forced to hire a special staff to obtain housing for these delegates.

Throughout the U.S. the situation is similar to that in New York City. More and more Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other minority groups are moving into the slums of the central city as the middle and upper-class whites move into the suburbs. Discrimination is tending to make the centers of cities black ghettos hemmed in by white suburbs. Thus while the U.S. government is continually making preachments against discrimination, it is allowing this form of "Apartheid" to become part of the "American way of life."

III. PEOPLE'S HEALTH

MAIN KILLERS AND DISEASES

Statements that the U.S. is the healthiest country in the world overlook facts that generally receive little or no publicity. As one example, infant mortality, or deaths of children under one year old, showed a rate of 26.0 per 1,000 live births in 1956, but rose to 26.3 in 1957 and to 27.1 in 1958, the U.S. Children's Bureau reports. It said that 9 foreign countries in 1958 had better records than the U.S. in infant death rates.

A man 40 years old today has life expectancy only two years longer than a man of the same age in 1900. At birth life expectancy in this country is nearly the best in the world, having increased about 3 years in the past decade. But at the age of 40 it is now among the lowest in all countries.

U.S. Public Health figures show how many Americans are suffering from various degenerative diseases. Heart disease comes first. If deaths from all diseases of the cardiovascular system are included, the number in 1958 totaled 894,100 or a rate of 516 per 100,000 of the population. From diseases of the heart alone, 633,590 died in that year at a rate of 365.7 per 100,000. Hypertension with heart disease took the lives of nearly 75,000 persons at a rate of 43 per 100,000. Heart disease, in fact, accounts for more than half of all deaths in this country.

The second greatest killer in the U.S. is cancer which in 1958 took the lives of 252,320 persons at a rate of 700 a day and of 145.6 per 100,000 of the population. Deaths from cancer in 1960 were expected to exceed those of 1959, when over 250,000 died from this disease.

About 45 million of all Americans now living will eventually have cancer. Soon or later, cancer will strike two out of three families; it is now killing at the rate of one man, woman or child every two minutes.

Program Against Cancer: The late Sen. Richard L. Neuberger (D., Ore.), who was himself saved from death by cancer but died in

March 1960 from a cerebral hemorrhage called for a far-reaching "crash program" to solve the riddle of this dread disease. He pointed out that in 1959 the American Cancer Society spent some \$13 million for cancer research. Of the \$75 million budget of the government-supported National Cancer Institute, about \$68 million went into some phase of research, while about \$4 million was spent in cancer research through the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund, the Sloan-Kettering Institute and various pharmaceutical firms. These expenditures together provided only about \$85 million for cancer research, equivalent to the cost of about four B-58 bombers. Even though the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute was increased to \$110 million for fiscal 1960, it was still equal to only a little more than the cost of a nuclear submarine loaded with Polaris missiles.

Sen. Neuberger asked that the sum of \$500 million be placed at the disposal of the National Cancer Institute, to be distributed in grants for cancer research. He also called for the international pooling of medical discoveries through an Institute of International Health; and forgiveness of 50% of loans under the National Scholarship Act to any medical student or other scientist who will spend at least 5 years in medical research.

In relation to his program, Sen. Neuberger commented: "Half a billion dollars may seem like a lot of money *per se*, but not when we relate it to the lives of 45 million American victims of cancer. It comes down to only slightly more than \$10 per life—per irreplaceable human life."

Other Causes of Death and Illness: Influenza and pneumonia in 1958 killed 57,430 persons at a rate of 33 per 100,000 of the population. Diabetes took the lives of 26,600 or a rate of more than 15 per 100,000. Accidents in that one year killed over 93,000 at a rate of 53 per 100,000 and about 40% of these were motor vehicle accidents. Some 18,500 persons in 1958 took their own lives in recorded suicides or at a rate of nearly 11 per 100,000.

"Not only does half the population have some form of chronic disease, but only 13% of the remainder are free of some type of physical defect," concludes Dr. W. Coda Martin of Los Angeles, formerly visiting physician at the Bird S. Color Memorial Hospital, New York City.

Some 17 million persons suffer from allergic disorders; 9 million from severe mental disorders; 10 million from circulatory and heart dis-

eases; 8.5 million from ulcers of the stomach and duodenum; 200,000 from muscular dystrophy; 250,000 from tuberculosis (100,000 new cases reported each year) despite the new drugs available for its control; 250,000 from multiple sclerosis; and 550,000 from cerebral palsy. There are around 4 million mentally retarded children. These figures are estimates based on reports of major private health agencies and U.S. Public Health Service.

Progress that has already been made in recent years in conquering disease in this country indicates what might be accomplished if larger funds were available for medical research and treatment. Notable advances have been made in conquering heart disease, poliomyelitis, tuberculosis, scarlet fever and other children's diseases. Diagnostic and therapeutic techniques have improved. These advances should be made available to all the people whether or not they have the money to pay for expensive medical care.

In Lower-Income Groups: Death rates have always been highest among the poor. A Committee of Physicians, writing on "Waste in American Medicine" (*Monthly Review*, Sept. 1960), points out that, "With all the advances in medical science, this still remains true. Lower income groups die at higher rates than upper income groups. The differentials are greatest among the young, and they are most striking for the infectious diseases (like tuberculosis and pneumonia) the very illnesses that can be most readily prevented or treated."

A higher frequency of disabling illness is also found among those in the lower income groups. This is particularly true of chronic ailments, the committee shows. Most forms of cancer, arthritis, asthma, respiratory infection, disorders of the genital organs, and skin diseases are more prevalent among the poor. Even heart disease, commonly regarded as the affliction of bankers and executives, occurs at higher rates among persons of lower income. Accidents of all types are more frequent among the poor, not to mention industrial injuries and occupational diseases. These higher rates of illness and death reflect, in part, the fact that lower income groups in the United States receive much less medical care than the well-to-do.

POISONS IN FOOD AND AIR

Strontium-90: In an extensive survey in 1959 of the radio-active strontium-90 in milk, the Consumers Union of the U.S. obtained

samples in 27 cities. It found that the over-all average was about one strontium unit higher than the average found in its 1958 survey. (*Consumer Reports*, Feb. 1960.) Strontium-90 is a radioactive by-product of nuclear fission that causes bone cancer and leukemia.

The U.S. Public Health Service in its July-August, 1959, testing in 9 cities found the average was nearly three strontium units higher than its 1958 average for the same months. The average annual figure for 5 cities tested monthly for more than two years, it found, was more than three units higher in July 1959 than in July 1958. Further increases were reported in later months of 1959.

At hearings in May 1959 by the subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, it was disclosed that the fallout of radioactive debris from nuclear bomb tests came down much faster than was originally reported. About half of it may fall in one to five years, the testimony showed. Previously it had been held that only about half the radioactive debris came down in the first 5 to 10 years.

A report by the Lamont Geological Observatory on strontium-90 in the human body showed that strontium units in the bones of American children up to 4 years old had jumped to 1.37 in 1957-58, or twice the level of one year earlier and three times the level of 1954-55. Even if there were no more tests of nuclear bombs, it is estimated that the amount of strontium-90 in the bones of growing children will not reach a peak until about 1966.

Fallout Effects: In a speech before a meeting of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy in New York City in 1959, Dr. Linus Pauling, professor of chemistry at California Institute of Technology, stated: "Human beings are damaged by strontium-90 and other radioactive substances produced by nuclear bomb tests. The principal damage that these materials do is to cause cancer. It is likely that hundreds of thousands of people now living, perhaps as many as a million, will be caused to die of cancer as a result of damage done by the radioactive fallout. . . . It gets into the food we eat, especially the milk, and it is then built into the bones of human beings. Every human being in the world now has strontium-90 in his bones, whereas 15 years ago nobody in the world had this radioactive substance in his bones. The strontium-90 irradiates the bone marrow and bone tissue in such a way as to cause leukemia and bone cancer."

"If the human race survives," he says, "the probable effect of the

carbon-14 produced by the bombs tested so far (180 megatons) will be to cause in the world 1,000,000 stillbirths and childhood deaths, 330,000 children with gross physical or mental defects, and 2,500,000 embryonic and neonatal deaths, spread out over many generations. (There is some overlap between the first two categories.)" Other scientists have estimated twice as big an effect. (See *Fallout*, pamphlet by Linus C. Pauling, 1959; also his book, *No More War!*, 1958.)

Chemicals and Commercial Interests: Virtually every bite of food that people in the U.S. eat has been treated with some chemical somewhere along the line. This is the conclusion of an expose by William Longgood after a 4-year study of the subject, the results of which were published in book form in 1960 under the title, *Poisons in Your Food*.

One example of such chemicals is stilbestrol, a synthetic hormone used to fatten poultry and livestock. It is known to be a carcinogen or cancer-causing substance, and continuous exposure to small doses is considered to be more harmful than occasional large doses. Some countries have already banned its use for the above purpose but not the U.S. It is still a useful drug in certain types of diseases when properly prescribed by a physician.

The author shows the fallacy of the argument in relation to these poisons, that "too little is used to be harmful." Additives are being used in more and more foods and there is no guarantee that the so-called "safety tolerances" are really safe.

Another example of poisonous chemicals in food became front-page news in the papers shortly before Thanksgiving, 1959. The U.S. government warned that huge supplies of cranberries had been contaminated with a weed-killer that had caused cancer in animals. Some growers had incorrectly used the chemical *before* instead of after the harvest.

How many people, asks Longgood, "are dying now or will die in the future because our food laws are designed to protect commercial interests first, and people afterward?" All additives or pesticide contaminants should be clearly listed on the food package or container. He urges housewives to seek and demand pure foods without such poisons and to insist upon their rights to have pure food.

Air Pollution: "The exhausts of motor cars, the pulverized rubber of tires, all the toxic products of industries released into our environment, create a situation whose consequences will become apparent

only in the future." This is the conclusion of Dr. R. J. Dubos, microbiologist at the Rockefeller Institute in N.Y. City, writing in *Harper's Magazine* (Oct. 1960). He says that air pollution has become the "pestilence that stalketh in the darkness." Its consequences are seen, for example, in the chronic bronchitis that is the major modern health problem in England and Northern Europe and that is rapidly creeping on us in America.

It also incites and aggravates many other debilities on which little specific research has been done, the American Public Health Assn. reported in a symposium on the subject. (*N.Y. Times*, Nov. 3, 1960.) It noted that only about \$11 million was being spent this year for such research by all agencies of the government and industry, or less than the cost of one Navy bomber.

RISING COSTS OF MEDICAL CARE

Prices charged for medical care in 1960 stood at 55% above the average of 12 years before—and higher than any other major part of the government's consumer price index. Medical services that cost \$100 in 1947-1949 had soared to \$155. The increase in the cost of medical care was twice as great as the general rise in all items covered by this index.

Per capita expenditures for nearly every item of medical care increased by at least 50% during the 11-year period, 1948-1958, and for some the increase was much greater. For all private expenditures for medical care and health insurance, the per capita amount rose by 82%, "in a period when per capita disposable income was going up only 41%." (*Social Security Bulletin*, Dec. 1959.)

The nation's private medical care bill rose by more than \$1 billion during the one year 1958, the U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare reported. The total was then an unprecedented \$16.4 billion, or \$95.65 for each of the 171 million persons then in the civilian population. In the previous year 1957, the total was \$15.4 billion or \$91 per person. (These figures exclude medical expenditures by private charity.)

Of the 1958 total, \$11.9 billion was in direct payments made by individuals for services received, while \$4.5 billion represented expenditures through prepaid health insurance.

Public expenditures for medical care in 1958 amounted to about

\$5.5 billion, bringing the total up to about \$22 billion. Public outlays cover expenditures for health and medical care under veterans' programs, workmen's compensation and disability, public assistance and vocational rehabilitation.

Family Payments: American families now spend an average of \$294 a year for personal health services, the Health Information Foundation reports after a recent study. It shows that the doctor bill takes 34¢ of the current health dollar. Hospitals take 23¢; drugs and medication, 20¢; dental services 15¢; and other medical goods and services, such as eye-glasses and special duty nursing, 8¢.

But families differ very much in the amount they spend for medical care. One-third spent less than \$100 a year, while another third spent from \$100 to \$299. The other third spent more than \$300, while 16% of this group in the 12 months of 1957-58 spent more than \$500. The chances are one in five that a family's medical bill will exceed 10% of the family's income, and one in 50 that it will exceed 50% of income.

In a typical recent year, half a million American families had medical bills larger than their total incomes for that year. A witness in San Francisco before the McNamara Senate subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, October, 1959, waved a sheaf of papers in his hand, explaining these were hospital bills, totaling more than \$2,000, for the care of his wife in a recent illness. "My savings are all gone now," he said, "What shall I do the next time one of us is sick?"

"People with higher incomes are in a better position to seek and secure medical services than are those with low incomes," the U.S. Public Health Service pointed out in its report, "Physicians for a Growing America." While the average family spends 5% of its income on medical care, medical costs are not spread evenly.

Especially in relation to expenses for physicians' services, tests, drugs prescribed, and dental care, it is not usually the need that determines the extent of service but the amount of money available to pay for it.

Spending on medical care rises with family income but declines as a proportion of family income. For a family with less than \$2,000 a year, payments for medical care in 1953 averaged \$130 a year—an amount they could ill afford. Payments for medical care ranged upward to an average of \$353 for wealthier families with incomes of \$7,500 or more.

Hospital Charges Doubled: Rates charged by hospitals in 1958

had soared more than 110% above the 1947-49 level. Hospitals report that their average expenses increased from \$14.06 per patient-day in 1948 to \$29.24 in 1958. For a one-day stay in a hospital the average charge has gone up 73% in the past 10 years, and is expected to continue rising indefinitely at a rate of from 5% to 10% a year. For hospital services, per capita expenditures of the population rose from \$12.96 in 1948 to \$29.76 in 1958—an increase of about 130%.

Cannot Afford the Cost: Even the modest City Worker's Family Budget now allows about \$350 a year or an average of about \$6.70 a week for medical care. But even this budget of about \$6,000 a year is beyond the reach of at least two-thirds of the nation's spending units.

The situation in relation to medical care is summed up by a Committee of Physicians: "In spite of the positive responses to health problems, the needs of millions are not met. Those in greatest health need—the poor, the aged, the country-dwellers, the Negroes, the mentally ill—get the meagerest amount and the poorest quality of service." ("Waste in American Medicine," in *Monthly Review*, Sept. 1960.)

5% of National Income: Despite all the increases in the cost of medical care, especially in the cost to individuals, no one should imagine that the U.S. people are spending too much for health care. Taken together, all public and private expenditures for health care in a year now amount to not much more than 5% of the \$410 billion of national income. And the total private and public health expenditure in a year is equivalent to only about half the amount that goes into military spending by the U.S. government.

Waste and Duplication: Increased expenses for medical care have been partly the result of duplication of health organizations. It is estimated that public-spirited Americans now contribute over \$1 billion a year to organizations formed to combat health problems. The givers can deduct these contributions in computing their income taxes. But the number of such organizations competing for the contributor's dollar is growing rapidly.

The *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 11, 1960) reports that many givers are bewildered because there is so much duplication among health agencies. The lack of cooperation and duplication of effort result in increased campaign and administrative expenses. About 100 health organizations now run national fund drives, compared with only 15 in 1940.

Expenses of the many campaigns eat up an increasing proportion of

the money raised. Campaign costs took nearly 20% of the funds contributed to health agencies in Los Angeles in 1959. The National Foundation, formerly the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, reported that its 1959 campaign expenses took about 19% of the funds raised as against 14% in 1958. One agency raising money to help the blind reported that in 1959 over one-third of the amount raised went for campaign expenses.

The *Wall Street Journal* concludes: "This splintering of the health field into more and more separate agencies, each with its own staff and offices, leads to spiraling administrative costs. And the fierce competition frequently boosts fund-raising costs to a level where they gobble up a startlingly large chunk of donations." The whole picture is one of unplanned, uncontrolled charity, wasting an increasing portion of its funds on overhead and fund-raising costs.

PRICE GOUGING IN DRUGS

One of the biggest stumbling blocks hindering improved health in this country has been the monopolistic price-fixing policies of the private drug industry. Its profits are about double those of the manufacturing industry as a whole.

The U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, headed by Estes Kefauver (D., Tenn.) has held extensive hearings and made careful studies of this industry. Some of its findings are summarized below.

The profits of the major companies have been enormous. One of those examined by the committee, the Schering Corp., which had developed two drugs for arthritis, in the course of 5½ years made net profits totaling more than the entire cost of its original investment. Restrictive patents and cross-licensing made these fat profits possible.

High Profits and Prices: Summarizing some of the Kefauver Committee's findings, David Cushman Coyle, in a Public Affairs Institute pamphlet, *How To Get Safe Drugs and Cut Their Cost*, showed that Carter Products, Inc. "now tops the list of major American companies, with its goldmine, Miltown," a leading tranquilizer. Its 1958 profits on net worth were at the rate of 38.2%. Another company, American Home Products Corp., selling the same drug under the name of Equanil, and paying royalties to Carter, came next on the list of big profit makers with the rate of 33.5% on net worth. And

"these rates of profits are after federal income taxes of 52%. A profit of 38.2% after taxes therefore means that before taxes the company was making nearly 80% per year on the stockholders' investment as it stood in that year. As for the stockholders' *original* investment, of course, the profit rate is much higher."

The drug companies have in many instances been able to eliminate price competition and to maintain uniform, high prices. Such price competition as there is in the industry is based essentially on a number of small companies that do not engage in huge advertising campaigns and are not well known.

But even *Life* magazine admitted (Feb. 15, 1960), that the more than \$2 billion total paid by the public for prescription drugs last year, "even considering the miracles modern drugs accomplish, is too high." It agreed with representatives of Consumers Union and others that, "Unlike other major industries, this one has the advantage of selling to captive consumers—sick people who cannot shop around but must buy what the doctor orders."

Price-fixing by the big companies tends to keep the price of certain drugs at non-competitive levels. In a speech in Congress, March 22, 1960, summarizing the work of the committee up to that time, Sen. Kefauver said: "Where competition can be offered by smaller companies, prices by the drug manufacturing companies in sales to the Government are sometimes one-fifth, one-sixth, or one-seventh of the price to the druggists. But where there is no competition from small companies, if the large companies hold a patent monopoly they generally bid at identical prices."

Prices for identical drugs were also shown to be four or five times as high in the United States as in other countries, and even the U.S. Government itself, for example its Military Medical Supply Agency, has in some cases been forced to buy abroad to save money.

The U.S. drug companies themselves frequently bought drugs abroad at low prices and then sold them in the U.S. at a big profit. For example, officials of Parke, Davis & Co. admitted that they bought chloromycitin in Italy for \$1.52 a bottle and then sold it in the U.S. for \$51 a bottle.

Research and Promotion: In attempts to justify their monopoly prices the big companies emphasize their high research costs. However, most of such research is not basic with a view to improving a drug but designed to "gimmick" it up to insure monopoly control over its

production and sale. The research may merely give the drug some meaningless patentable feature which makes it appear better than the previous year's version of the same drug.

But even the research that is done is not financed mainly out of company treasuries. The committee showed that in one year (1957) of the \$400 million spent in all drug research in the U.S., the companies accounted for only about 30%; the rest was done in government, university or other noncommercial laboratories.

It was shown also that most of the major breakthroughs in new drugs did not originate with the drug companies. For example, insulin, penicilin, streptomycin and the Salk polio vaccine were all developed by independent researchers; and government agencies here and abroad were responsible for many of the new modern drugs.

The biggest expense of the companies is not for research but for flamboyant, exaggerated advertising and promotion. High promotion costs account for about a third of the price of many prescription drugs. And a survey of the 20 largest drug companies showed that selling expenses averaged 24% of the sales dollar or about 4 times what they spent for research.

Sen. Kefauver estimated that the drug companies spend about half a billion dollars annually in vying for the doctor's attention or about \$3,000 per doctor in the country. One expert witness estimated that the doctors were bombarded with over 24,000 tons of drug advertising material yearly, on which the postage alone cost the companies some \$12 million. And this does not include about \$68 million worth of free samples sent to the doctors or pressed on them by drug company salesmen (called "detail men") in an effort to get them to prescribe particular brand names to their patients.

When doctors, thus pressured, prescribe drugs by their brand-name rather than by their chemical or generic names, it means much higher prices to the patient. Even *Life* magazine admitted that a typical discount drug store charges \$23.25 for a drug for arthritis, which it would sell to the patient for \$4.50 if asked for by its pharmaceutical name.

Effects upon the sick of the high fixed monopoly prices charged were brought out at the hearings. It was shown that many old people with low incomes have been forced to go without food in order to buy the heavily-promoted and high-priced drugs. And drug prices have been so exorbitant that persons released from mental institutions have been forced back in because they were unable to afford the expensive

medication that would enable them to live relatively normal lives outside.

MEDICAL MANPOWER SHORTAGES

The number of physicians in the U.S. is falling behind the increase in population. A decade ago in 1949 there were 135 physicians to every 100,000 of the population but by 1959 there were only 133. The ratio of active dentists for each 100,000 persons in the U.S. was 58 in 1930, and 53 in 1940. By 1959 it was only 49.

Shortage of Physicians: There are great differences among areas of the U.S. in the ratio of physicians to population. Among the states, New York has the highest ratio or 185 physicians to every 100,000 inhabitants, while Mississippi has the lowest or 69. The numbers are badly distributed between urban and rural regions.

In general, the supply of physicians and other medical personnel is concentrated in cities or communities that have the most money to spend. Where buying power is less, there are fewer doctors in relation to total population. And almost everywhere for the aged, for Negroes and lower-income groups, fewer health services are available. This situation leads to duplication and waste of medical facilities in some areas while in others there are serious shortages.

Some 860 hospitals in 1959 were asking for 12,890 interns and 1,300 hospitals were seeking 31,820 resident physicians. Since the country's medical schools in 1959 graduated only 6,895 physicians, there was a vast gap between the number needed and the number available.

The Public Health Service warns that the ratio of physicians to population in this country will decline seriously in the next two decades unless training facilities are increased more than is now planned. Even to maintain the present ratio of physicians to population, the number graduated annually from medical schools must be increased by about 50% before 1975.

Nurses Needed: The worst shortage of all, in hospitals, is the shortage of nurses. Almost every hospital in the U.S. is handicapped by a shortage of professional graduate nurses. In many hospitals, one-fifth of the nursing jobs are unfilled.

Although the total number of fully-trained nurses increased from about 375,000 in 1950 to 460,000 in 1958, the increase was not much more than the rate of growth in the population. The ratio of nurses

was 247 per 100,000 of the population in 1950 and 264 in 1958—a gain of less than 7%.

American Medical Association: Policies of the American Medical Association have tended to restrict the number of physicians and to limit the opportunities open to young doctors. AMA maintains what amounts to a closed society which “stabilizes the profession by controlling the flow of recruits and by allocating the coveted positions, especially in hospitals,” writes Dr. Oswald Hall, professor of sociology at the University of Toronto, who recently conducted many confidential interviews with physicians in the U.S. He says this closed fraternity uses informal but powerful methods to “incorporate the new doctor into the profession, to repel the intruder . . . to minimize mobility, and to control competition.” (*Harper's Magazine*, Oct. 1960.)

By repelling the “intruder,” Dr. Hall refers to the AMA policy ruling out “the ethnically undesirable.” It does little if anything to combat the anti-Semitism which survives in hospital administrations in many parts of the country. And general discrimination against Negroes is such that only a very few have any hope of getting the kind of pre-medical or medical education qualifying them professionally for first rate internships.

For many years the AMA's Washington lobby has been able to defeat extension of the Social Security Act to include doctors of medicine, although many physicians desire and need its benefits. Only about 65,000 physicians who are employed in hospitals or as salaried employees are included in the Social Security system. Some 170,000 self-employed physicians are still excluded.

All forms of health insurance were for many years opposed by AMA's powerful lobby as “socialized medicine.” But in June 1960, it finally yielded somewhat on this issue, and approved a policy change permitting the association to cooperate with prepaid clinics or plans for prepaid medical care from panels or groups of physicians.

HOSPITAL FACILITIES

A general shortage of hospital beds all over the U.S. is considered more and more serious. The ratio of general and special hospital beds was 7.6 per 1,000 of the population in 1945, but by 1958 it had fallen to only 4.6.

But there are "striking differences," as the Public Health Service describes it, in varying regions of the U.S. in the number of beds available per 1,000 of the population. In 31 regions with 6 million people, there were in 1958 only 1.6 beds in general hospitals for each 1,000 persons, or less than half of the national average of 3.4 beds. But 20 other regions had an average of 6.2 acceptable beds for each 1,000 of the population.

Already in 1958, the Public Health Service found that 888,474 additional hospital beds were needed. Nor did this big figure include the 322,667 beds needed in nursing homes. The total shortage of beds, as officially estimated, thus came to 1,211,141.

In addition to these hospital facilities, the country also needs over 4,400 public health centers and over 5,000 diagnostic or treatment centers and 300 comprehensive facilities for rehabilitation.

Hospitals that are 50 years old or older are so out-of-date that they should be replaced. If full replacement is not required, many of the older hospitals should be modernized and improved. The American Hospital Association estimated in 1958 that about \$1 billion was needed for such modernization and major repairs on existing services.

Recently constructed hospitals having from 300 to 500 beds, and equipped to give young medical students opportunity to learn and gain experience, have cost between \$5 and \$14 million per hospital. This was reported by the Surgeon General's Consultant Group in October, 1959. Assuming a completely equipped hospital costs \$5 million, four of them could be built for the price of one old-fashioned submarine, costing \$20 million.

MEDICAL NEEDS OF THE AGING

After nationwide hearings during 1959-60, the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, headed by Patrick V. McNamara (D., Mich.), concluded "that a program of comprehensive health insurance is required to meet the minimum health needs of the retired aged." The need was so self-evident that for the first time the principle of federal aid in medical care for the aged was accepted by both the Republican and Democratic parties.

The cost of medical care is about 80% higher for the aged than it is for the rest of the population. But only about 6.5 million or 40%

of the 16 million persons over 65, have some form of health insurance, Arthur S. Flemming, secretary of the Department of Health, Education & Welfare (HEW) testified at the subcommittee's hearings.

This does not mean, however, that even the 6.5 million are adequately cared for. "Some of them have coverage most of us would recognize as inadequate," Flemming explained. On the low incomes of those over 65, he showed that 50% or about 7,650,000 older persons in this country have less than \$1,000 a year in income; about one quarter (23%) or 3,519,000 have between \$1,000 and \$2,000; 8% or 1,224,000 have between \$2,000 and \$3,000; while only 12% or 1,836,000 persons have \$3,000 or more.

On the basis of the low cost food plan devised by the Department of Agriculture, an income of less than \$2,560 for an elderly couple is probably uncomfortably low, the HEW secretary testified.

Illnesses and Suicides: Existing private programs for health insurance are too costly for the pocketbooks of those over 65 and the coverages are too limited to be of real assistance in cases of serious illness. Health problems naturally become more serious as the retired worker grows older, with less income available for any medical care. Heart disease, cancer, arthritis, arteriosclerosis and mental illness are all likely to develop and become more severe in these later years. Deafness, failing eyesight, falls or other accidents are more common among those over 65.

Saddest of all the McNamara committee reports is the one on the San Francisco hearings with its story of suicides by "senior citizens." The notes they left show that most of them were poor, ill, in pain and discouraged. Death rates for suicide by age in the U.S. as a whole show an extraordinary rise from middle to old age. In the middle years, 45 to 49, the rate for men was 25.4 per 100,000 in 1957. It increased steadily until for men 80 to 84 years old it was 60.7.

Health Insurance Proposals: In the face of such recognized need for medical care for older persons, the 86th Congress bowed to the lobbying of the American Medical Association and rejected the measure introduced by Rep. Aime J. Forand (D., R.I.) and backed by all organized labor. (See *Labor Fact Book 14*.)

Several measures, including President Kennedy's Administration bill, to provide health insurance benefits for the aged were entered in the 87th Congress in 1961. Similar to the Forand bill, the Administration measure called for financing through the social security system by a slight increase of $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1% in the social security tax rate for both

employers and employees, and by increasing the taxable earnings base to \$5,000 a year.

Under this bill about 14,250,000 persons over 65, including those under the social security and railroad retirement systems, would be eligible for health insurance benefits. It would provide hospital benefits, nursing home service and part-time home services. The AMA announced February 14, 1961, an "all-out effort" to prevent passage of this Administration medical-care program.

BECAUSE OF RACE OR COLOR

Mortality rates in the country as a whole reflect the lower incomes and consequently the lower standard of living of the Negroes and other nonwhites. The excess mortality of the Negro stems mainly from five causes: tuberculosis, pneumonia and influenza, nephritis, infections, and deaths by homicide—all closely related to the conditions under which the nonwhite people of the United States must live.

U.S. Public Health Service reports that death rates from tuberculosis are 17.6 per 100,000 for nonwhites, 6.6 for whites; from influenza and pneumonia, 62.5 for nonwhites, 32.5 for whites; from nephritis, 16.8 for nonwhites, 7.8 for whites; from infective and parasitic diseases, 5 for nonwhites, 2.5 for whites; from homicides, 22.4 for nonwhites, 2.3 for whites.

Infant mortality shown in the death rate of babies under one year old also reflects the difference in living conditions of white and Negro families. Inadequate diets among Negro mothers, poor housing, and lack of prenatal care all contribute to a death rate among Negro babies that is about twice that of white babies.

A white baby boy may expect to live, on the average, to be 67.2 years old or 7 years longer than the Negro baby boy whose expectation of life (at birth) is averaged at 60.6 years. The white baby girl may expect to live to be 73.7 years or 8 years more than the Negro baby girl, whose average is now reported as 65.5 years.

Areas in the cities of the U.S. that have the greatest number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans crowded into substandard housing are also the areas reporting the highest rates of tuberculosis and infant mortality. Testifying before the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in 1959, the Urban League of New York pointed out: "These congested areas can be found

by looking for the neighborhoods that report the highest rates of tuberculosis and infant mortality."

In Chicago the tuberculosis death rate among Negroes is six times that of whites. The high rate of tuberculosis and the substandard, overcrowded rooms of these slum areas are clearly related. Puerto Rican and Negro workers employed on the lowest-paying jobs cannot afford the better housing and better food that would bring them greater protection against disease.

Medical Care Harder to Get: One of the main reasons why the Negro people in this country suffer more illness and live shorter lives, on the average, than white people is the greater difficulty they have in getting medical care quickly when needed. Discrimination against Negro patients and Negro physicians is practiced in many hospitals in the United States.

The Negro people have less access to every type of medical care. Only about 2% of all physicians in this country are Negro; many of them were trained in smaller segregated medical schools because of discrimination in larger schools. Hospital facilities available to Negroes are notoriously inadequate.

MENTAL ILLNESS

At least one person in every 10 in the U.S. "has some form of mental or emotional illness (from the mild to the severe) needing psychiatric treatment," says the National Association for Mental Health, which estimates also that each year about 1,240,000 persons receive treatment in public and private mental hospitals or in the psychiatric wards of general hospitals. Also, "on any one day of the year 750,000 persons are under the psychiatric care of these hospitals." It reports that there are as many people in hospitals with mental illness as with all other diseases combined, including cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis and every other killing and crippling disease.

The number of patients is apparently decreasing slightly as the result of new drugs and more effective methods of treatment. The National Institute of Mental Health, a federal government agency, reports that at the close of 1959 "there were 542,721 resident patients in the Nation's 277 public mental hospitals, or a total of 2,142 fewer patients than during the same period in 1958. In 1959, for the fourth

consecutive year, there was a drop in the resident patient population in public mental hospitals." However, approximately 50% of all beds used in hospitals of all types in the U.S. are still occupied by mental patients.

In addition to those in hospitals an estimated 379,000 persons were patients of more than 1,200 outpatient clinics in the U.S. during 1955, the latest national census shows.

Preliminary data from N.Y. State studies indicate that, if current rates of admission to mental hospitals and current death rates remain constant, 1 out of every 10 babies born today will be hospitalized for mental illness at some time during his or her lifetime.

Cost and Shortages: The cost of mental illness is difficult to measure but the best estimates give a total of around \$3 billion annually for the care and treatment of the mentally and emotionally sick. Of this amount about \$1.7 billion comes from tax funds, with total direct costs met from other sources amounting to about \$220 million. The indirect costs, including the dollar value lost by patients and payments to general practitioners and specialists add up to about \$1.1 billion.

There is still a serious shortage of professionally trained people to provide adequate care, treatment, and rehabilitation services for the mentally ill as well as preventive services. Although the latest government report indicates that there are about 1,300 psychiatric clinics in the U.S., half of them are part-time and most of them have long waiting lists. They are also quite unevenly distributed with 50% of them in Northeastern cities, and 67% of them in cities with populations of over 50,000. Only 3% are in areas with populations below 2,500.

A similar situation prevails for the 10,500 psychiatrists in the U.S. with over one-third of them in New York or California and 54% of them concentrated in 15 metropolitan areas which have less than a third of the total U.S. population. In fact, 17 states have less than 50 each. Although the average for the whole U.S. is 1 for each 16,400 persons, 8 states have 1 for every 53,000 to 72,200 persons.

More professionals are needed in every category in the existing mental hospitals. After an inspection of 254 public and private mental hospitals in 1959 the American Psychiatric Association found that only 48 of them merited immediate approval and 72 conditional approval. The inadequacies in every professional branch were striking. In terms of minimum

needs the hospitals were only 57% adequate as to psychiatrists, 76% for psychologists, 23% for registered nurses, and 40% for psychiatric social workers. Overall the average number of professional personnel for every 100 patients in these hospitals is only 3.4 including all professional workers.

INCREASE IN ALCOHOLISM

Alcoholism and alcoholics form one of the worst and largest problems of U. S. society today. The rate of alcoholism in the U. S. is said to be greater than in any other major nation except France. Estimates run as high as 5 million so-called chronic alcoholics and about 3 million "problem drinkers" or additive drinkers to whom alcoholism is an immediate threat. The number is increasing at the rate of about 450,000 annually. About a fifth of all alcoholics are women.

The seriousness of the disease was noted by Wayne D. Williams in the *Christian Century* (Dec. 10, 1958): "Our society is producing alcoholics or problem drinkers at the rate of one for every twelve adults who drink." This means that "we have six times as many alcoholics as cancer patients and eleven times as many as tuberculosis patients. One out of ten diagnosed first admissions to public mental health hospitals is an alcoholic."

It is estimated that about 20,000 people are killed by drinking drivers each year and at least 400,000 additional people are injured in traffic accidents because of drinking. About 1 out of 3 fatal motor accidents involves a drinking driver, and local sampling indicates about half the fatal accidents involve either a drinking driver or pedestrian.

Dr. Howard Rusk (*N. Y. Times*, April 26, 1959) says that alcoholics are sick persons just as much as though they suffered from other known and recognized diseases. They are persons "who are peculiarly susceptible to alcohol and who are suffering from some tension, physiological or psychological, for which alcohol provides temporary relief. They are utterly unable to control their drinking themselves, but they can conquer their problem with help."

The advertising industry contributes considerably to the spread of alcoholism, obtaining around \$500 million a year from the liquor industry for advertising through the regular media. About \$400 million of this is for national advertising placed through ad agencies. For the pro-

motion of one type of liquor alone one company was appropriating \$4 million for advertising in the current year.

NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE PROPOSALS

Increasing costs of voluntary health insurance plans, profiteering by the drug industry, the appalling waste in present medical care, and the confusing multitude of private insurance plans have led many unions and other progressive organizations to seek a broad program for national medical care. For example, the Electrical Workers (UE) at its 1959 convention proposed a national medical care program, to include: "A National Health Service, providing free medical care to everyone in the U.S., as is done through the successful health program in Great Britain. Such a program would eliminate the need for health insurance now costing more than \$4 billion a year, eliminate in one move the economic hazards of illness, while raising the health level of the entire population.

"Federal research and care in the field of health such as cancer, heart disease, etc. would lead more quickly to results and an end to the multitude of overlapping private agencies collecting funds for this purpose."

This union said in its far-reaching proposal: "Only a federal health insurance system can take the profiteering out of illness and create an effective plan to protect the health of all people."

Other unions point out that the health problem of the low-income group cannot be solved on a piece-meal basis. Only national health legislation can reach the goal for this nation described as a situation in which adequate personnel, facilities and organization make comprehensive health services available for all, with a method of financing to make this care universally accessible. (See "The Case for Socialized Medicine," a special report by R. W. Tucker in *Socialist Call*, Fall, 1960.)

Rational Health Service: A committee of physicians, writing on "Waste in American Medicine" (*Monthly Review*, Sept. 1960), after describing the vast waste involved in medical care in this country, propose "a rational system of health service as a public benefit, available to all, systematically planned and provided through properly salaried teams of personnel working in a network of hospitals and health centers."

Pointing out that the U. S. is the last major country in the world in which health service remains mainly a private affair, the committee shows that even Canada has now launched general hospital care essen-

tially as a public benefit, and physicians' service will probably follow soon. In most of the rest of the world public medical care is accepted as an appropriate function of government for 90% or more of the population.

The physicians explain that a rational health service would mean organization of physicians and their co-workers into medical groups attached to health centers, with duties covering both prevention and treatment. Hospitals would be linked together in regional networks under a centralized plan. Nurses, dentists and others would be woven into the system as colleagues. Drugs would be produced for use and not for profit. Research would be conducted by universities and scientific centers for solution of major problems. There would be a constant focus on preventive medicine. It would mean "rehabilitation of patients back to their maximum role in society as a goal of the whole system."

The World Health Organization in its constitution points out that the purpose of all medical care is the "physical, mental and social well-being" of the whole population. Such a purpose looks toward a system of health service that would be adapted to the highest aims of science and the needs of the people.

IV. U. S. TRADE UNIONS

Latest estimates of American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations membership made by Pres. George Meany of that organization in February 1961, indicated some 12.5 million, or a decline of about 2.5 million since the merger in December 1955, or a loss of about a million exclusive of those in unions since expelled.

With about 3 million members in independent or non-affiliated unions, the total organized in all trade unions in the U. S. in 1961 would thus be about 15.5 million. About 1.7 million are in the Teamsters which has grown since it was expelled from the AFL-CIO for corruption in 1957. In this period, however, the AFL-CIO has continued to decline.

Trade union membership today thus makes up about a fourth of the civilian labor force or about a third of the nonagricultural labor force or approximately 38% of what is called the "organizable" labor force. Meany said that AFL-CIO would have to sign up about 400,000 new members a year merely to maintain its percentage of the labor force which is expected to increase by at least 1.2 million a year during the next ten years.

Five years after the merger, *Business Week*, December 10, 1960, noted that "fears of what the federation of 146 unions . . . might mean to society as a whole have proved groundless. . . . Actually, the merging of AFL-CIO, bringing together their diverse labor philosophies, has resulted in a more conservative labor movement. The new federation has gone very little further in any direction than the old and conservative AFL would have been willing to go; it has never gone so far as the ideas and aims of the CIO."

A review of the trends in the labor movement since World War II is contained in a new book *American Labor—Which Way?*, by George Morris. Details on union membership, structure, function and jurisdiction, with a full roster of organizations and officers, both AFL-CIO and independent, are given in Bulletin 1267 of the U. S. Department of Labor, called *Directory of National and International Labor Unions in the United States*, 1959.

The government directory issued in December, 1959, covered the year 1958 when the total membership had reached 18.1 million (a drop of almost 400,000 from 1956) with 15 million of them in AFL-CIO and 3.1 million in unaffiliated unions. The total number of national and international unions covered was 184, (135 of them in the AFL-CIO), the term international usually denoting unions with members in Canada. A total of 1.2 million members were outside the continental U. S. primarily in Canada.

About one million members were then in federal, state and local public service, with the remaining 17 million "almost equally divided between manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries." Again the biggest concentration of membership was in a few large unions with 7, each with 500,000 or more, accounting for a third of the total union membership.

THIRD CONVENTION OF AFL-CIO

The third biennial convention of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations met in San Francisco, September 17-23, 1959, attended by 916 delegates representing 125 national unions, 6 departments, 44 state bodies, 156 city bodies, and 41 local unions.

Official organ of U. S. Department of Labor, *Monthly Labor Review* (Nov., 1959), in an article on the convention, said it "revealed a labor movement very much on the defensive. . . . The charge that 'big business' was conspiring to weaken and destroy the labor movement was a recurring and, perhaps, dominant theme of this convention."

Membership: Report to convention showed that average total paid-up membership for the two fiscal years ended June 30, 1959 was 12,671,000, compared with 12,305,000 in 1955. This two-year average disguised the downward trend in 1959. Even so, the losses reported by 2 major unions were by Autoworkers, down from 1,260,000 in 1955 to 1,060,000 in 1959; Steelworkers, from 980,000 to 892,000. Two of the gainers were Retail Clerks, up from 259,000 in 1955 to 315,000 in the same period; while the Retail, Wholesale and Dept. Store Union rose from 97,000 to 107,000.

Organizing Difficulties: Executive council reported that about a

million new members had come into AFL-CIO through organizing efforts since the merger in 1955. (These new members were offset, however, by the expulsion of the Teamsters). In some areas new members had been signed up, "despite an unremitting anti-labor campaign of unprecedented proportions calculated to create the most unfavorable atmosphere for union activities." The report gave details on such union-breaking efforts especially in the textile and clothing unions in the South. After assaults and beatings of organizers, and other acts of violence against union men, the council said, "Appeals to federal agencies, to state authorities and to local officials for protection of civil rights have been to no avail."

Steel Strike Aid: The nationwide steel strike then in progress (see below) was vigorously supported by the convention which voted to ask all union members to donate one hour's pay a month to the strikers. It called on President Eisenhower not to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act but instead to call the union and company management to a White House conference to seek agreement.

Readmission of Longshoremens: Expelled from the AFL in 1953 for having "permitted irresponsible, corrupt and criminal elements to infect" it, the International Longshoremens' Association in January, 1959, applied for reaffiliation with AFL-CIO. A special committee of the executive council reported to the convention that the ILA in the six years since expulsion "had moved steadily toward compliance" with the standards demanded of it by the AFL in 1953. The convention voted to authorize reaffiliation on two years' probation subject to several conditions to be administered by the executive council.

Senate Committee on Improper Practices: One resolution blasted the McClellan Committee (Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field) for its failure to look into corruption in business. It said the committee "has focused powerful spotlights on those few corrupt individuals who are in unions while it has deliberately sought to block the public's view of corruption on a huge scale in business." Mostly the committee "has been little more than a vehicle of reactionary elements seeking to discredit the American labor movement for their own partisan political purposes."

The Senate committee, it said, "was far too often used as a vehicle for whipping up hysterical support for anti-labor legislation instead of getting at facts needed for anti-racketeering and anti-corruption legislation. Indeed, some members of the committee sought to use the com-

mittee to challenge the very right of the American trade union movement to exist."

Political Education: The convention again declared the AFL-CIO's "independence of any political party and our determination to support worthy candidates, regardless of party affiliation, whose records and attitudes indicate a devotion to the welfare of our country and its people. In this endeavor we welcome the support and cooperation of other groups with the same ideals and aims as our organization."

It called attention to the "tremendous outpouring of corporate wealth now flowing into political channels. Large corporations, spearheaded by General Electric and including large steel, oil and auto companies are using stockholders' funds in unprecedented political activity."

In referring to the defeat of labor through the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill it said this measure was another product of the Southern Democrats and Republican coalition "that is the desperate answer of the nation's reactionary forces to the gains of labor at the bargaining table in the last two years and at the polls in 1958." (Other activities of organized labor in the 1960 elections are discussed in Chapt. VI.)

Racial Discrimination: Pres. A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, an AFL-CIO vice president, charged that the Longshoremen's union that was being reaffiliated with AFL-CIO had directed discriminatory tactics against Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

He also introduced a resolution calling for the expulsion of the Brotherhoods of Railroad Trainmen, and Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, unless (within six months) they removed bans against Negroes. But the convention backed a watered-down proviso authorizing the executive council to seek compliance on the part of the two unions with the civil rights policy of AFL-CIO. It omitted the time limit, and also the threat of expulsion.

Another Randolph resolution condemned racially segregated locals and called for their "liquidation", but the resolutions committee deleted this word, and only the seven other Negro delegates and one or two white delegates backed his position in the final vote.

For his courageous action Randolph was treated to a tongue lashing by George Meany who shouted, "Who the hell appointed you as the guardian of the Negro members of America?" Meany's words aroused a wave of protest and contributed later to the organization of the national Negro American Labor Council (see below). The *Chicago Defender*, a Negro paper, in an editorial said, "There are over 1 million

Negro members in the AFL-CIO to whom Meany's attitude is not only reprehensible, but insufferable. Both his manner and language toward A. Philip Randolph, one of the most revered leaders in the U.S. . . . are repulsive and intolerable. . . . The AFL-CIO should either forbid racial segregation in its ranks or stop posing as champions of democracy for the American workingmen."

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People backed up Randolph. In a wire to Meany it urged the end of all segregated locals even where Negroes wanted to keep them, declaring in part: "We recognize that progress has been made by many trade unions, but as long as thousands of Negro workers are entirely excluded by some unions and restricted to segregated locals by others, much remains to be done. Refusal of the AFL-CIO convention to take effective steps to eliminate these abuses reveals an unwillingness to implement its own democratic professions."

Effects of Foreign Trade: Resolution on international trade supported the government's reciprocal trade program, but with "whatever modifications may be necessary in the basic legislation or in its administration to assure maximum benefits and minimum injury to workers in the United States as well as in other nations" of what it calls "the Free World." However, it omitted any reference to the possibilities of expanding trade with the socialist countries.

It called also for assistance to workers, firms and communities adversely affected by increased imports. Delegates of the Potters and the Shoe Workers protested that the position of the federation did not provide sufficient protection against foreign imports.

International Situation: Convention repeated cold war positions which have for many years reflected the stand of the U. S. State Department on world affairs. However, it urged U. S. government to be "unsparing in its efforts to achieve a reduction in armaments on the road towards the abolition of all nuclear tests. We should seek the prohibition of all weapons of mass destruction through an effective system of international inspection, supervision and control." Pending attainment of these objectives, the U. S. should "strengthen its own capacity to deter and, if need be, defeat military aggression." It urged a strengthening of NATO and opposition to Soviet Premier Khrushchev's proposal for a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations.

Strongest support for a summit conference on disarmament came from Frank Cousins, General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers

Union, fraternal delegate from the British Trades Union Congress. In his address he said that, "We in my own union want the ending of these nuclear tests for all time. . . . We want an agreement that we would not be involved in using this terrible weapon. . . . Real progress amongst the people cannot be sought by producing ever more horrifying weapons of mass destruction, nor do we lightly disregard the fact that the widespread use of these weapons brings the danger that war can be started by accident and not by deliberate design." (A year later Cousins led the successful fight at the British Labor Party Conference at Scarborough, England, which backed unilateral nuclear disarmament, neutrality for Britain and eventual closing of U. S. bases in that country.)

Depressed Areas: The federal government was asked to utilize all of its resources "to alleviate chronic unemployment." This should include establishment of a special agency to coordinate efforts to assist distressed industrial and rural areas and to administer "a comprehensive program of technical aid, public contract priorities, low interest loans for new and expanding private enterprises, public works loans and grants, vocational retraining, and supplementary compensation for displaced workers during the retraining period." This program "should be geared exclusively to the needs of areas suffering chronic distress and its benefits specifically denied to any employer who closes or curtails his operations in one community in order to seek special advantages in another."

Housing Expansion: The housing resolution asserted again that the recognized goal of national housing policy should assure construction of at least $2\frac{1}{4}$ million dwelling units a year. This should include, it said, a minimum of 200,000 low-rent public housing units. "Only an improved and greatly expanded low-rent public housing program can provide opportunity for low-income families to obtain decent housing within their means." In addition, "low-interest, long-term loans should be made available to provide good homes at reasonable rates for hundreds of thousands of moderate-income families who cannot afford the exorbitant financial charges and sky-high rents now required to obtain good housing."

Other Resolutions: These conventions always pass scores of other resolutions on domestic issues of general interest to the American people and of particular interest to labor. Some of the most important at this convention:

Called for bargaining to attain a cut in the workweek without reduc-

tion in pay; and an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act "to provide for a standard 7-hour day, 35-hour week", and a legal minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour.

Asked for a congressional conference on automation with a view to determining the possibility of the shorter workweek and other steps to meet technological advances that had cut factory production and maintenance jobs by 1.2 million since 1953.

Vowed to continue to press for: civil rights and civil liberties, federal aid to education, health programs and improvements in social security, and federal unemployment insurance standards.

One of the most comprehensive and progressive resolutions dealt with taxation and was aimed especially at providing tax relief for families of low and moderate income by raising the level of personal exemptions above the present \$600 figure which "was inadequate even at the time of its adoption in 1948." American workers, it said, "insist that a tax system adhere to the basic principle that taxes be imposed according to ability to pay. It is time for America's tax program to return to this basic principle."

Industrial Union Department: One of the most important departments of AFL-CIO is open to national unions organized in whole or in part on an industrial rather than a craft basis. At its last convention, November 9-10, 1959, it claimed 68 affiliates representing 6.7 million members, or about half the membership of AFL-CIO. A large part of its support comes from the Auto Workers, Steelworkers and Machinists, and its officers are Walter P. Reuther, president, and James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, along with 14 vice presidents.

IUD has held several widely-attended conferences, institutes and forums on automation, industrial relations, science and technology, education and legislation. It maintains its own research and publications divisions and issues many reports and popular pamphlets on subjects of special interest to its members.

This department has taken the lead in calling for the organization of the unorganized. At its 1959 convention Director Albert Whitehouse declared that, "As labor-management relations have become more formalized, we have become more institutionalized. The crusading spirit of our early days has all too often been lost as union members and their leaders relax in the complacency of materialistic gain." Reciting the purely defensive measures that the labor movement had been compelled to adopt against the attacks of the employers in recent years, he urged that or-

ganized labor "relinquish its defensive stature" and "hurl back the offensive launched by Big Business and lead its own attack. And this attack must continue until every vestige of social injustice and economic want is eliminated from our society."

CO-EXISTENCE POLICIES AND UNION DELEGATIONS

The top leadership of the AFL-CIO continued its general policy of following the Pentagon line in international relations. One of its main efforts in 1960 was a world affairs conference in New York City, April 19-20, addressed by such advocates of limited nuclear war as Henry A. Kissinger. He warned of the dangers of relaxation and disengagement and declared that Europe could not be defended without a well-armed Germany. Douglas Dillon, then the banker Under Secretary of State, talked of the "grave and continuing threats to peace" which he said were coming from the Soviet Union.

But even at this cold-war inclined conference of AFL-CIO officials some of the delegates held that the time had come for more stress on disarmament and peaceful co-existence. Secretary-Treasurer Al Hartnett of the Electrical Workers (IUE) proposed that reciprocal U.S.-USSR trade union visits would help to ease world tensions, although George Meany angrily answered that such visits would be a "betrayal of free unionists."

Earlier in the year, Feb. 20, 1960, Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey of the Auto Workers had expressed sharp disagreement with the official AFL-CIO position in an address before a Chicago meeting on "Labor's Stake in Peace" sponsored by the Peace and Education Committee of the American Friends Service Committee.

He called for a frank and full discussion of U. S. foreign policy "without fear of slurs and slanders of those within our government who use the fear of Soviet Russia and Communism as a convenient way to stifle democratic discussion of this most important problem." He said: "I believe it is incumbent upon us to publicly discuss the question of peace and war in a rational and objective manner so that we can develop policies and programs that can minimize the tensions that could erupt into World War III, and endeavor to create a public climate that could make universal disarmament a reality." And he added that "no meaningful decision toward universal disarmament can be achieved with our

present policy toward Red China", urging "a complete re-evaluation of our foreign policy toward China on a realistic and objective basis."

He favored also the stepping up of U. S. discussions "with the Russians, Great Britain and France for the ending of the testing of atomic and nuclear weapons." The government should immediately establish a National Planning Board "for the peaceful use of our military plants so that we can guarantee full employment to the workers now engaged in military production."

Secretary-Treasurer Frank Rosenblum of the Clothing Workers had expressed similar views at that union's convention in June 1960, warning those persons in the labor movement who have "refused to budge from a traditionally hostile and insulting attitude toward Communist Russia." He said, "We have no alternative but to settle our differences through negotiation and through accommodation. . . . the undeniable reality of today is that *no one* can win the atomic race." Also, "We cannot expect to reach an understanding if we sit down to negotiate in an atmosphere of provocation and name-calling." He asserted that, "The labor movement should be among the most positive forces working for peace," and criticized those who "refuse to participate in an exchange of labor delegations" between the two countries.

One union that already had sent a delegation of three to the Soviet Union late in 1959 was the independent Longshoremen and Warehousemen of the West Coast. It was the first official American trade union delegation to the USSR since the cold war began. Returning, it urged "the widest exchange of trade unionists—an exchange which is long overdue."

Soon after Meany and the AFL-CIO leadership expressed their horror at the thought of any contact with Soviet trade unions, Pres. Joseph Curran and three other delegates of the National Maritime Union, in the summer of 1960, made a 17-day, 8,000-mile journey in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Sea and River Workers of the USSR.

Upon their return they issued a 32-page report which covered their observations and interviews including one with Premier Khrushchev. The delegation reported it had accepted the invitation of the Soviet seamen's union "because we felt that the 'quarantine' policy of the AFL-CIO is, at best, useless. . . . Exchanges of delegates—officials at all levels and rank-and-file members—should be encouraged. With the world in the condition it is in, our labor movement has a responsibility to do whatever it can to develop understanding and friendly relations with

people behind the Iron Curtain." Also, "We believe that it is important that our country start facing facts about this other great world power. It is there, it is moving and nobody is going to wish it away." Concerning its travels in the Soviet Union it said: "We were met with what seemed to be genuine warmth and friendship wherever we went."

Patrick E. Gorman, Secretary-Treasurer of the Meat Cutters, was another U. S. labor leader who visited the Soviet Union in 1960, returning with a generally friendly report and a call for more visits by others to that country and contacts with its unions. He was the guest for six days at the end of August of the Food Industry Workers Union of the USSR.

In a report in the official organ of his union, *The Butcher Workman*, October, 1960, he told of a visit to "one of the most modern packing plants in all the world" in Leningrad, noting that "there were safety devices I wished could be applied to some of our packinghouse operations in the U. S."

He urged that, "More labor leaders from the U. S., more ministers of all denominations, more scientists and more businessmen should go to Russia. . . . Our own labor leaders can not continue to feel smugly secure in their own comfortable positions, and at the same time attempting to shout down a political ideology which for better or for worse now controls more than one-third of the world's population."

"In retrospect", he continued, "only 15 short years ago we and they were both fighting side by side to crush Hitler and nazism. They were as much Communists then as now, yet we fought together and won together. I still believe that a way can be found in which we can work and exist together."

He concluded: "With atom bombs all about us, and more and more nations developing these hideous monsters, which all agree threaten our civilization with complete obliteration in the event of war, I can only repeat the phrase I originated some years back, and which has been repeated by others thousands of times, 'It is co-existence, or no existence.'"

A group of ten local AFL-CIO trade union leaders from the Middle West visited the USSR unofficially and not as representatives of their unions in the summer of 1960. They included officials from Auto Workers, Building Service, Textile, Shoe, Clothing, Office Workers, Railroad and Dining Car, Hotel and Restaurant, and Butcher Workers. Jack Spiegel, Organizational Director of the Chicago District of the Shoe Workers, reported on the trip in an address to the Rally for Peace and

Friendship of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship in N. Y. City November 8, 1960.

A number of trade union officials in California, New York and other areas were active in organizations like SANE working for the end of nuclear tests. Independent national unions such as the Electrical Workers (UE) took a strong position against the crushing burden of armaments, stressing the fact that a reduction in military spending offers no threat to the jobs and wages of working people. At its 25th convention in September 1960 the UE called for an end to the cold war and "its replacement by an era of peaceful co-existence of all nations."

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NEGROES

Some progress has been made in recent years in winning at least partial equality for the 1.2 million Negroes in the AFL-CIO. But there are still only 6 unions that have Negroes in elected positions as full-time functionaries on the national level, one of these the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, a virtually all-Negro union. In only 4 unions are Negroes on national executive boards. In the Auto Workers one of every 17 members of the staff is a Negro although one of every 8 of the membership is a Negro, and no Negroes serve on the national executive board.

A report, *Racism Within Organized Labor*, was made by Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at the annual meeting of that organization January 3, 1961. He indicated that in the five years since the AFL and CIO merged, "the national labor organization has failed to eliminate the broad pattern of racial discrimination and segregation in many important affiliated unions," and its efforts to eliminate jimcrow had been "piecemeal and inadequate."

Hill named as examples unions that still bar Negroes from membership either through a constitutional ban (Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen) or through unwritten practices (Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Operating Engineers; Bridge, Structural & Ornamental Iron Workers; Plumbers & Pipe Fitters; Plasterers; Lathers; Sheet Metal Workers; and Boilermakers).

He noted that there were still jimcrow locals of all-Negroes or all-whites in such unions as Carpenters; Hod Carriers; Railway Carmen and Railway Clerks. He charged there were separate seniority rosters for white and Negro members which tend to restrict Negroes to un-

skilled jobs and deny them the advantages of seniority status. This affects many thousands of workers in southern paper mills, chemical plants, pulp works, oil refineries, steel plants and textile mills.

NEGRO AMERICAN LABOR COUNCIL

At the end of May 1960 some 800 delegates from 18 states met in Detroit and organized nationally the Negro American Labor Council. Previously organized locally, with members in leading cities, it hoped to expand and recruit eventually a mass membership.

The constitution of the new Negro labor body called for removal of all color bars to membership in unions or to progress on the job. It urged a reform of apprenticeship systems, elimination of racially segregated unions, and a greater representation for Negroes at all levels of union jobs from clerical to top policymaking. The Council voted to cooperate with the NAACP.

The AFL-CIO "high command", reported labor correspondent A. H. Raskin in *New York Times*, May 29, 1960, "has viewed the council's formation with considerable coolness." The only member of its executive council to accept an invitation to attend was Pres. Walter P. Reuther of the Auto Workers. I. W. Abel, Secretary-Treasurer of the Steelworkers, addressed the convention.

Pres. A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters was elected President of the new organization. He stressed the fact that it was "not a labor union" and that it was not aspiring to become a "black federation of labor," declaring it was "pro-AFL-CIO leadership" and "non-partisan but not non-political."

At the AFL-CIO executive council meeting February 28, 1961 Randolph called upon the labor federation to abolish racial discrimination in its member unions within 6 months. Speaking for the NALC, he charged that even when restrictions based on race are removed, there may still be collusion between unions and employers to keep Negroes out of promotion and training opportunities.

INCREASES IN WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

The number of white-collar workers in the labor force has since 1956 outnumbered the blue-collar workers. The last decade, 1950-60 has continued the long-term trend in employment of white-collar workers.

In that decade the total nonfarm labor force rose 17%. But white-collar employment rose 27% and by 1960 had reached 47% of nonagricultural employment. During the same period blue-collar workers increased only 4%, and by 1960 made up a little under 40% of the labor force. The third classification, service workers, rose 28% in the decade and by 1960 accounted for nearly 14% of the nonfarm labor force.

These figures are from a study of "White-Collar Employment" in *Monthly Labor Review* of the U. S. Department of Labor (Jan. and Feb. 1961) by Carol A. Barry, which estimates total white-collar workers at 28.5 million, blue-collar at 24.3 million and service workers at 8.3 million in 1960.

Other important facts noted in this study: In contrast to the previous 50 years, when clerical workers were the fastest growing white-collar group, the last decade has been marked by the rapid increase of professional and technical workers who now comprise over 12% of persons in nonfarm occupations. For the decade as a whole such professional and technical employment grew at a rate more than 3 times greater than that of total nonfarm employment in the U.S.

Virtually all the increase in blue-collar jobs during the 1950's took place among skilled craftsmen and foremen, while "operatives and kindred workers" actually decreased by 1% and laborers rose only 5%.

Structure of White-Collar Employment: The growth in numbers of white-collar workers has been closely related to the expansion of the service-producing as distinct from the goods-producing industries—manufacturing, mining and construction. In 1952 about 80% of all white-collar workers were employed in service-producing industries and between 1952 and 1960 about 70% of the increase in white-collar workers occurred in this sector. However, "the striking feature" of gains since 1952 in white-collar employment is that they have been *proportionately* as large in the goods-producing as in the service-producing industries. In that period white-collar workers in construction and in durable goods manufacturing increased by 36%, or as much as in finance, service and public education combined. However, in trade, transportation and public administration the increase was much slower.

The changes in manufacturing employment are of particular significance because two-thirds of all production and related workers in manufacturing are covered by union agreements and account for close to half of all U. S. union membership.

The shift toward white-collar work in manufacturing is indicated

by the fact that between 1952 and 1960 such workers rose from around 20% to 24% of employment in this field. And in the same period the professional and technical workers group alone rose by about 65%.

Union Problem: The Bureau of Labor Statistics in its latest survey estimates that only about 12% of U. S. trade union members are in the white-collar ranks. It puts the number at around 2.2 million in 1958. Three out of four of the members in this category were in 37 unions where they accounted for at least 50% of all members, and more than half were in unions which were entirely, or almost entirely, made up of white-collar workers.

Everett Kassalow, research director of the AFL-CIO Industrial Union Dept., in a paper on "Occupational Frontiers of Trade Unionism" before the Industrial Relations Research Association, December 1960, noted that up to this time the special nature and conditions of white-collar workers "have doubtless helped to retard unionism." But that recently the nature of white-collar jobs has been changing under the impact of automation and mechanization. "The introduction of giant computers and other electronic devices in office work is already causing a considerable upheaval among many groups of white-collar workers," and creating a "factory-like" environment hospitable to the spread of unionism.

WOMEN IN UNIONS

Latest Department of Labor estimate of women in unions was 3.3 million in 1958, or 100,000 less than in 1956. Their number and influence has of course been greatest in such industries as textiles, clothing, shoes and communications (chiefly telephone) where they make up a large percentage of employees. About 1 out of 7 women in the nation's labor force is a union member, and nearly 1 out of 6 union members is a woman.

In 1959, some 20 unions each reported more than 35,000 women members, but 48 unions (one-fourth of all) had no women members. The largest number of women were in the Ladies Garment Workers with 332,000, and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers with about 282,000.

Seven other unions each had over 100,000 women members, as follows: Automobile, 102,700; Communications Workers, 153,200; Electrical Workers (IUE), 111,300; Electrical Workers (IBEW), 225,000;

Hotel & Restaurant Workers, 174,500; Retail Clerks, 176,900; Teamsters, 156,000. Women members in the Teamsters union are mostly food and cannery workers on the West Coast.

Unions having women members find them among the staunchest and most militant of workers. For example, in the hospital strike in New York City, and in the cotton mill strike at Henderson, N. C. in 1959 and in the cannery workers' strike in 1960, women were especially active on the picketlines.

After the merger of AFL-CIO, the AFL-CIO Auxiliaries brought together some 50,000 women who are wives, daughters or sisters of union members. They assist the unions in strikes as well as in educational, political and community developments. Their purpose "is to further the program of the AFL-CIO; to foster the organizing of the unorganized members of union families and to educate them in the benefits of trade unionism . . . and to promote social and cultural activities."

WEST COAST LONGSHOREMEN'S AGREEMENT

The most significant collective bargaining gain of 1960 relating to automation and mechanization was made by the International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union. Even *Fortune Magazine* (Dec., 1960) admitted that this union, whose President is Harry Bridges, "did best" in that year in its struggles with the employers.

A Mechanization and Modernization Agreement was reached on October 18 between the union and the Pacific Maritime Association. The union organ, *The Dispatcher* (Dec. 12, 1960) called it "the most spectacular gain made by any union in modern times." It summarized the agreement, covering about 15,000 workers, made by the longshore division of the union on the West Coast as follows:

No layoffs for any of the presently registered work force. No individual speedup or infringement of safety rules. A guaranteed floor under earnings that might drop as a result of mechanization or modernization. Voluntary early retirements at 62, 63, or 64 at \$220 a month until social security retirement age when government benefits are included. Mandatory early retirement, if necessary, at \$320 a month until 65 when normal pension begins. Vested interest in a \$5 million per year fund, amounting to \$7,920 each at normal retirement age, a prorated amount at early retirement. Additional disability and death benefits.

In return for these substantial benefits the employers are relieved of

previous restrictions in the contract and working rules dealing with sling loads, first place of rest, multiple handling, gang sizes and manning scales, so as to permit them to operate efficiently, change methods of work, utilize labor-saving devices and direct work through employer representatives while explicitly observing the provisions and conditions of the contract.

The union paper concluded that, "For the first time in history a significant group of employers has recognized the worker's right to 'a piece of the machine' and a union has recognized that mechanical progress is here to stay and continue." The agreement runs till July 1, 1966, and during this period the employers would pay the longshoremen as a whole about \$27.5 million for work lost through gradual replacement of men by machines.

STRIKES IN 1959

About 1,880,000 workers were involved in strikes begun in 1959, the Department of Labor reported. (Its estimates do not cover unauthorized and "wildcat" strikes.) This figures compared with 2,060,000 in 1958 and was one of the lowest in recent years—lower than any other postwar year except two, 1954 and 1957. Of the total, some 519,000 were in basic steel and related industries.

Major issues in 1959 strikes were wages, hours and supplementary benefits. These accounted for half (50.5%) of all the year's strikes and for more than two-thirds (70.5%) of the workers involved. Wage increases alone accounted for a third of all the strikes and for nearly half of the total workers involved.

New strikes starting in 1959 numbered 3,708 compared with 3,694 in 1958. Recent years showing a greater number of new strikes included 1955 and the years 1950-1953. Largely as a result of the long steel strike, however, the number of man-days lost through strikes in 1959 totaled 69 million—a record high for the 13 years since 1947. And man-days per worker involved (36.7) for the same reason set a 30-year record. Of the total number of strikes, 20 each affected 10,000 or more workers.

Some significant strike movements of 1959 are noted below:

Coal Miners: In Harlan County, Kentucky, a strike of Mine Workers on March 9, 1959, closed 26 coal mines. It spread to Tennessee and West Virginia to involve some 10,000 miners, asking that wage increase of \$2 a day, won by contract in December, 1958, be extended to "truck

mines" and ramp owners (at railroad stations). Many small mine owners signed the new contract, including the 40c-a-ton union royalty for miners' health protection. National Guard was called out by owners, and union was enjoined by court from picketing, but some strikers remained out until July.

Rubber Strike: U. S. Rubber Co. and Rubber Workers on May 1 signed an agreement covering 26,000 workers on strike since April 9. Minimum pension benefits, effective July 1, 1959, were raised to \$2.10 a month for each year of service. Pensions were raised and vesting rights at age 40 after 10 years' service were also added. Supplemental unemployment benefits were raised to a weekly maximum of \$30 for a worker with no dependents. After 55 days on strike B. F. Goodrich signed a similar agreement on June 9 for its 14,000 workers; Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. signed on June 12 for its 18,000 workers. Wages were not an issue in any of these rubber strikes.

New York Hospitals: In New York City, a strike of 3,000 non-professional maintenance and household workers at 7 non-profit hospitals began May 8, 1959. Led by the Retail, Wholesale & Department Store Union (Local 1199) workers struck for union recognition and for higher wages. Settled June 22, the strike resulted in some wage increases, improvement in working conditions, and a "declaration of policy" from the Greater New York Hospital Association, providing for a grievance board, although not for union recognition. Wages had been as low as \$32 for a 40-hour week. Agreement established \$1 an hour minimum wage and overtime pay at time and one-half after 40 hours work.

Mine-Mill: Some 35,000 of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers struck August 10, 1959, against major copper companies. On November 28 union signed a 2-year contract with American Smelting & Refining Co., covering 6,000 workers at 13 plants, providing increases of 22.4c an hour. Fringe benefits included improved vacations, higher medical and welfare benefits; and a major medical insurance plan.

After a 129-day strike, Kennecott Copper Corp. December 16 settled with the union, covering 4,900 workers in a 18½ month contract. Package settlement totaling 22.3c an hour included severance-pay provision to cover employees displaced by automation, and improved hospital and welfare benefits.

West Coast Shipyards: About 14,000 workers struck August 24, 1959 at shipyards along the Pacific Coast, halting ship construction and

repair work. Those led by Machinists sought a wage boost of 22c an hour over two years. Carpenters and metal trades unions of AFL-CIO later joined the strike for higher wages. Shipyards signed agreement with unions October 19 for 39c-an-hour package increase, spread over 3 years including improvements in paid holidays and pensions.

Packinghouse Gains: Meat production members of Packinghouse Workers struck September 4, 1959 against Swift & Co., employing 17,000. At 36 Swift plants agreement was reached October 22. Workers gained wage boosts of 15c an hour over 2 years; severance pay increases for those maintaining seniority; and 3 weeks' vacation after 10 years' service. Negotiations with Wilson & Co. broke down and strike of its plants in 8 cities employing 6,500 started November 3. Company on November 30 attempted to operate with non-union workers as strikebreakers. Members of other unions in Minnesota provided supplies for strikers and the National Farmers Union brought food. Strike ended February 22, 1960, when union and company signed a 2-year pact on the same basis as the Swift agreement. An arbitration panel ruled that strikers were Wilson employees with seniority rights and must be taken back.

Henderson Cotton Strike: At the Harriet-Henderson Cotton Mills at Henderson, N. C., some 1,100 workers led by the Textile Workers Union went out November 17, 1958, and continued on strike for 12 months. But by November, 1959, there were "no jobs to return to", as *Textile Labor* put it. In May, Gov. Luther H. Hodges, who in 1961 became U. S. Secretary of Commerce, had ordered out National Guard to stop mass picketing. Soon afterward the company opened the mills with strikebreakers, mainly from farms in eastern North Carolina and southern Virginia.

In a frame-up against the strikers, 8 union members, including the union vice-president Boyd Payton and 2 other union officers were charged with "conspiracy" to dynamite the struck plant, although no dynamiting took place. Sentenced in July 1959 to terms ranging from 2 to 10 years at hard labor, they were imprisoned in November 1960. Strike was broken but picketing continued for many months.

Longest Strike in Steel: Beginning July 15, 1959, some 519,000 steel workers were out for 116 days in the longest strike in the industry's history. Represented by the United Steelworkers, strikers closed down about 85% of the mills. Emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were invoked October 21, 1959, when government's request for an

injunction, ordering workers to return to work for 80 days, was granted by federal court in Pittsburgh. Injunction was upheld by U. S. Supreme Court November 7 and strikers were thus forced back to work with issues remaining unsettled.

Agreement was signed January 5, 1960, by the union and major steel companies, providing benefits totaling about 39c an hour over a 3-year period. In another 3-year pact steel companies agreed to take over all insurance costs for active employees, thus raising take-home pay of workers by about 6.5c an hour.

Commenting on the final agreement, *Steel Labor* said: "The 500,000 members of the United Steelworkers employed in the nation's basic steel industry as well as their plucky wives and children wrote their own triumphant terms. . . . For 116 days of sacrifice and hardship—the longest forced shutdown in the history of the industry, the United Steel Workers stood fast on the picket lines."

HARD FOUGHT STRIKES IN 1960

Some 1,400,000 workers were on strike in stoppages that began in 1960. This number matched the low postwar level reached in 1957. Number of reported strikes, 3,300, was the lowest since 1942, but some were protracted and difficult with employers using scabs and company unions to defeat the workers.

Strikes in 1960 resulted in about 20 million man-days lost, below the level for any postwar year except 1957 when they totaled 16.5 million. Among 1960 strikes, some of long duration, 16, each involving 10,000 or more workers, occurred in construction, railroad, shipbuilding, aircraft, and electrical industries. A few of these are included in the following record of important strikes of 1960, most of which resulted in wage increases and improvements in fringe benefits, with protection of work rules and job security also involved.

Shipyard Strikes: About 17,000 workers were on strike at Bethlehem Steel Co.'s 7 shipyards in 4 states. Longest shipyard strike on record, it started January 22, 1960 when 12,000 walked out at Quincy, Mass., and Hoboken, N. J., and at an Atomic Energy Commission site at W. Milton, N. Y. when company failed to agree on a contract.

Led by Marine & Shipbuilding Workers, it spread to include 5,000 others, continuing to June 19 when a 3-year pact was signed. Union won a 25¢-an-hour wage increase in 4 steps (4 ½¢ immediately);

improvements in pensions; and increase in life insurance to provide \$5,000. Seniority and job security provisions were strengthened.

In Aircraft Plants: After a short strike in June, Douglas Aircraft, with plants in California, North Carolina and Oklahoma signed a 2-year contract with Auto Workers covering about 50,000 workers. It won a 7¢-an-hour wage increase effective in the 2nd year; higher pension benefits; improved health and welfare benefits; and layoff benefits up to \$500. Cost-of-living escalator clauses were continued, omitting the next 1¢ step increase.

About 10,500 workers of Lockheed Aircraft's missile and space division in California, New Mexico and Hawaii were covered by a contract signed July 15 by Machinists. Some 4,000 of these workers in California plants had been on strike since June 15. Union won wage gains of 4¢ an hour, plus 3¢ to be paid in July, 1961; improvements in health and welfare benefits; and layoff benefits of \$50 per year of service (up to 10 years) for those laid off at least 4 weeks.

Railroad Struggles: After a 12-day strike starting September 1, Transport Workers Union and 3 craft unions in System Federation 122 signed an agreement with the Pennsylvania RR. Some 20,000 workers struck, but company furloughed all its 73,000 employees to close down the system. Contract provided severance pay for those losing jobs in sale of company powerhouse; coupling of air hoses to be done by maintenance workers; no sub-contracting of work to outsiders or to non-union labor; requirement of full crews with no vacancies. Wages were not an issue.

On Long Island RR, 1,350 Trainmen struck for 26 days from July 10, winning a 5-day week agreement, first on any U.S. railroad. Union accepted 2½¢-an-hour cut in recent wage increase and 3-year moratorium on other demands. Company was covered by strike insurance and collected \$50,000 a day during strike. Union filed suit against company, charging strike insurance was an "illegal and secret conspiracy."

At General Electric: About 70,000 workers at 54 GE plants were on strike from October 2 for 3 weeks. Electrical Workers (IUE) signed a 3-year contract on October 23 for an immediate wage increase of 3%, a second wage adjustment in April, 1962; and improved pensions, insurance and health benefits. The union lost its previous cost-of-living escalator clause. At Schenectady, N.Y., 8,700 workers in Local 301 joined the strike October 6 and returned to work October 17.

Pres. James B. Carey of the IUE blamed "Boulwareism" for the strike, as a "policy of feudal arrogance toward workers and their unions." Name comes from the no-bargaining policy of GE Vice-President Lemuel R. Boulware in 1946 GE strike.

About 10,000 GE workers represented by independent Electrical Workers (UE) were not on strike but accepted October 28 a new 3-year contract with GE. UE's contract included 2 wage increases of 3% each but it gained also provisions for termination and layoff pay equal to 1 week's pay for each year of service for an employee who has been with the company 3 years or more—a provision not included in IUE's settlement.

Mine-Mill in Idaho: About 2,200 of the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers in Coeur d'Alene area, Idaho, struck in May and were out until December. Some 1,700 struck May 5 at Bunker Hill lead mines and were joined May 25 by 500 at American Smelting & Refining mines in the area. Union sought renewal of contract on same terms as agreed on by 95% of non-ferrous industry. Mine-Mill filed charges of unfair labor practices against AS&R for refusal to bargain. Strikers had help from many other unions; National Farmers Union contributed food, delivered by Teamsters. Mine-Mill on December 18 signed a 3-year contract with AS&R providing for wage increases of 15¢ to 21¢ an hour and improvements in pensions, health and welfare benefits.

Kohler's Long Strike: In the longest strike in U.S. labor history, Auto Workers at the Kohler Co. in Wisconsin saw a somewhat more favorable development in 1960. National Labor Relations Board ruled on August 26, 1960, that the Kohler Co. must rehire most but not all the strikers it had discharged in the strike which began April 5, 1954. (See *Labor Fact Book* 14, p. 91.) In an effort to have all strikers reinstated, the union appealed to U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington which agreed to hear both union and company appeals.

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN AND TAFT-HARTLEY

Landrum-Griffin Law: On September 14, 1959, President Eisenhower signed the Landrum-Griffin (Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure) Law. It was enacted following months of one-sided publicity by the (McClellan) Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Fields. Under the pretext of

correcting abuses, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. and other reactionary groups forced through Congress a law which attempts to regulate almost every detail of a union's activity, burdens unions with cumbersome and expensive requirements, and makes unlawful several previously established methods of organizing and collective bargaining.

The law amends the Taft-Hartley Act to the further disadvantage of unionism. It gives state courts and agencies, often unfriendly and more easily reached by employer pressure, the right to step into cases where the National Labor Relations Board declines to accept jurisdiction, the previous "no man's land."

Where Taft-Hartley prohibited a union from striking or urging others to strike as a group to enforce a secondary boycott, Landrum-Griffin prohibits inducing a refusal to work by any employee individually. A "secondary boycott" is an attempt to put pressure on an employer with whom the union has a dispute by forcing another employer to stop doing business with him. The new law also made it illegal to induce any employee to quit in order to force an employer to recognize a union which is not certified as collective bargaining agent, or to force an employer to sign a hot cargo contract. A "hot cargo" contract is one in which the employer agrees not to discipline employees for refusing to handle goods from a firm where there is a dispute. Exceptions to this rule are made for the garment industry and the building trades.

The alleged reason for the Landrum-Griffin law, protection of union members from their unions, is contained mainly in the so-called "bill of rights." Here the law affirms as legal requirements and throws added safeguards around various rights which members of democratic unions have always enjoyed. It compels unions to file detailed reports on their structure and operations, and annual financial statements. In addition to a long list of other requirements, it prohibits anyone from holding office in a union who during the previous 5 years has been a member of the Communist Party. Another provision opens the door for company spies by allowing any candidate for union office to inspect the list of union members.

A new Bureau of Labor-Management Reports was set up under the Department of Labor to administer the new law, with an army of snoopers empowered to poke into the affairs of unions at will. Shortly after the act became effective Secretary of Labor Mitchell tele-

graphed to Pres. Harry Bridges of the west coast Longshoremen, giving him 10 days to furnish a list of all officers and employees except clerks and janitors who within 5 years had been members of the Communist Party or convicted of any of the crimes listed as bars to holding office. Bridges replied that nothing in the law required a union to undertake such an investigation, and Mitchell dropped the demand. In October, 1960, Mitchell served papers on the National Maritime Union and on the Longshoremen's organization on the Great Lakes charging that their elections had been illegally conducted and that new ones must be held. As of March, 1961, the cases had not been brought to trial.

Taft-Hartley Administration: In a bitterly-worded resolution the AFL-CIO Convention of 1959 characterized the five-man National Labor Relations Board administering the Taft-Hartley Act as being stacked by the Eisenhower Administration entirely with former employer attorneys and labor relations consultants. It accused the Board of (1) adopting a series of new interpretations prohibiting a minority union from picketing, putting an employer on an "unfair list," informing the public that an employer is non-union, or asking customers not to buy the employer's product, if the Board believes the union is really seeking recognition; (2) adopting a new penalty requiring unions to repay all dues and initiations received in the six months before the filing of charges if the Board finds that persons have been illegally denied jobs under union-security agreements; (3) allowing employers under guise of "free speech" to interfere with representation elections by threats to close the plant if a union wins, or by accusing unions of being un-American or Communistic; (4) delay in reestablishing jurisdiction over cases which it had rejected under previous narrow rules; (5) slowness in handling unfair labor practice and representation cases, the backlog of which had increased by nearly 2,000 in the previous year.

The strike-breaking 80-day "cooling off period" provisions of the Act were invoked for the 16th time in the east coast Longshoremen's strike of October, 1959. As in most other cases, no settlement was reached while the injunction was in force. The other cases included 4 on the docks, 4 in atomic energy installations, 3 in coal, and 1 each in meat, telephones, copper, and steel.

In its first ruling on the new Landrum-Griffin ban on "hot cargo" agreements the Board held (March, 1961) that the Lithographers viola-

ted the law in San Francisco and Miami by first refusing to work overtime and then striking to obtain a clause that the employers would not handle work from non-union shops or shops where there was a strike or lockout.

In its first decision involving an agency shop agreement in a state with a "right-to-work" law, the Board ruled 3-to-2 (Feb. 1961) that because of that law General Motors Corp. was not guilty of an unfair labor practice in refusing to bargain with Auto Workers concerning such an agreement in 9 Indiana plants. Indiana is the only industrial state of the 20 which now have such laws. An "agency shop" agreement is one in which as a condition of employment workers who are not union members are required to pay the equivalent of initiation fees and dues in consideration of the benefits they derive through the union contract.

Another "first" by the Board was its ruling (Feb., 1961) that the four-year picketing of the Stork Club in New York by Waiters' and Chefs' unions was illegal because though the unions claimed it was informational to the public and no longer organizational as at the beginning, it had the effect of causing drivers not to make deliveries.

When Sheet Metal Workers in New York struck in protest against use of purchased flexible metal tubing and spiral pipe in new building construction (March, 1960), the Board obtained a temporary restraining order sending the men back to work on the ground that the strike was a secondary boycott. The union maintained that the walkout was not a secondary boycott but a lawful protection of jobs, and ignored the court order.

Court Decisions: The U.S. Supreme Court overruled (March, 1960) a Board decision in the old case of Curtis Bros. furniture store in Washington, D.C., against the Teamsters, that peaceful picketing to gain recognition within a year after a lost election was illegal in 1954 because the Landrum-Griffin law made it illegal in 1959.

Teamsters locals in Detroit and Pontiac, Mich., were upheld (Feb., 1961) by a federal judge in their refusal to produce all financial records since Jan. 1, 1959, so that the government could decide whether the reports filed in March, 1960, were accurate. "In this case," said the court, "the Department of Labor has refused to show or has been unable to show any basis for this investigation."

V. CIVIL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS

IN DEFENSE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Four men were in prison in 1960, not even accused of any crime, and at least 30 more persons were in danger of imprisonment for claiming their rights under the U.S. Constitution, when questioned by prying legislative committees. They had all invoked the First Amendment in defense of their right to refuse to answer on matters of thought, association and affiliation.

In a pamphlet, *Behind the Bars for the First Amendment*, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee recounted the facts on these cases involving 36 men and women, with names and occupations of defendants and status of the cases, as of March, 1960. Since then, two of the defendants, both women, have been cleared by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C.

On June 18, 1960, this court overturned the conviction of Mrs. Mary Knowles, librarian of the Quaker-operated library at Plymouth Meeting, Pa., and of Mrs. Goldie Watson, former schoolteacher in Philadelphia. Mrs. Knowles had refused in 1953 and again in 1955 to answer certain questions at two hearings before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS). She had been convicted of contempt and sentenced to four months in prison and also a fine of \$500. She was supported in her stand by many of the Society of Friends (Quakers) and the library which received for its stand an award of \$5,000 from the Fund for the Republic.

Convictions Upheld: In its June decision, the Court of Appeals affirmed the convictions of six men whose names and sentences follow: Robert Shelton, copy editor on *N. Y. Times* (6 months—\$500); William A. Price, former reporter on *N. Y. Daily News* which had dismissed him in 1956 (3 months—\$500); Herman Liveright who lost his job as program director at a New Orleans TV station in 1956 (3 months—\$500); John T. Gojack, a vice-president of United Electrical Workers (9 months—\$200); Norton A. Russell, engineer of Yellow

Springs, Ohio (30 days—\$500); and Bernard Deutch, nuclear scientist of Springfield, Pa. (90 days suspended—\$100). These six appealed their cases to the U.S. Supreme Court.

All of these men either specifically or inferentially relied on the First Amendment which guarantees freedom of speech, religion and assembly. Three of them, Price, Shelton and Liveright, appeared in 1956 before the SISS, and the other three appeared in 1954-55 before the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC).

Among other First Amendment cases outstanding at the end of 1960 was that of Alden Whitman, a copy editor on the *N. Y. Times* who was sentenced September 14, 1959, to 6 months (suspended) and fined \$500. He had refused on January 6, 1956, to answer questions about former associates before the SISS. His conviction was upheld on July 7, 1960, by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, and then appealed to the Supreme Court.

Barenblatt Jailed: Lloyd Barenblatt, former psychology instructor at Vassar College, surrendered on November 10, 1959, to serve 6 months in the federal prison at Danbury, Conn., for refusing in 1954 to tell the HUAC about his political beliefs and associations. On June 8, 1959, the U.S. Supreme Court by a close vote of 5 to 4 had reaffirmed his contempt conviction.

Dissenting against this decision were Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justices Hugo L. Black, William O. Douglas and William J. Brennan, Jr. These four agreed that the inquiry in this case was "exposure for the sake of exposure." In his stirring dissent, Justice Black argued that "exposure and punishment is the aim of this committee and the reason for its existence." This was the Supreme Court's second ruling in the Barenblatt case. In June, 1958, it had upheld the conviction by a 5 to 4 vote.

The 1959 Barenblatt decision had a far-reaching effect in continuing the cases of other witnesses, charged with contempt, who had relied on the First Amendment. To a considerable extent, this later ruling undid the Supreme Court's Watkins decision of 1957 which had upheld witnesses' right to invoke the First Amendment. (See *Labor Fact Book* 14, pp. 95-96.) The Barenblatt ruling had the effect of reducing the Watkins case simply to a warning by the high court that Congressional committees must have fair procedures.

Uphaus Imprisonment: Willard Uphaus, 69-year-old lay preacher in the Methodist Church and Christian pacifist of New Haven, Conn.,

on December 14, 1959 entered Boscawen jail in Merrimac County, N.H., to serve a one-year sentence which ended December 12, 1960. He had refused to give the guest lists of the World Fellowship Center at Conway, N.H. of which he is the director, as demanded in 1954 by the state attorney general Louis C. Wyman. The center had started in 1941 as a forum-resort open to people of all races, creeds and political beliefs.

In the Superior Court at Concord, N.H., January 6, 1956, Uphaus answered all questions about himself and denied he had ever been a Communist. But he again refused to reveal names because he said it would mean that innocent persons would be harassed. (See *Labor Fact Book* 14, p. 108.) He based his refusal on his conscience and on the First Amendment. His case was twice before the U.S. Supreme Court which, on June 8, 1959 in a 5 to 4 decision and again on November 14, 1960 by a vote of 6 to 3 ruled against his appeal.

Among countless protests against Uphaus' imprisonment was an editorial in the *New York Times*, April 21, 1960, which commented: "As long as Willard Uphaus remains in jail, the conscience of many Americans will rest uneasily. . . . Yet Dr. Uphaus remains legally in jail, under surprisingly severe conditions of imprisonment." Efforts to have him released on bail in July, 1960, met with a refusal from Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter.

Mathematician Davis: Dr. H. Chandler Davis, formerly instructor in the mathematics department at University of Michigan, entered the federal penitentiary at Danbury on February 2, 1960, to serve a 6-month sentence for contempt. He had refused on May 10, 1954, to answer questions about his political beliefs and associations before the HUAC. He was dismissed by the university, an action condemned by the American Association of University Professors and the American Civil Liberties Union. Davis called the committee hearings a "political inquisition." Later he was editor of *Mathematical Reviews*, published by the American Mathematical Society at Providence, R. I. and he continued in the position after leaving prison.

Prof. Pauling and SISS: Dr. Linus C. Pauling, professor of chemistry at California Institute of Technology and a Nobel prize winner, was called before the SISS June 21, 1960 and again October 11, 1960. At both hearings he refused to give the names of those who circulated petitions signed by 9,235 scientists in 44 countries calling for a ban on nuclear weapons. The petition was signed by 36 Nobel Laureates,

representing 12 countries, and by 101 members of the Academy of Sciences of the USA. He said the committee, in making the demand, violated the First Amendment. Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D., Conn.) who sat as a one-man subcommittee, did not actually direct the famous scientist to produce the documents in question. Pauling's lawyer, A. L. Wirin of California, had objected to the request for these names and Dodd did not overrule the objection. Scientists and professors at many colleges all over the country signed statements supporting Dr. Pauling in his refusal to comply with the committee's demand.

Other Cases: Arthur M. McPhaul as secretary of the Michigan branch of the Civil Rights Congress refused in June, 1952, to give the HUAC the membership lists or records of the C.R.C. The U.S. Supreme Court on November 14, 1960, by a 5 to 4 ruling affirmed McPhaul's conviction, and on January 16, 1961, he began a 9-month prison sentence. He was formerly an Auto Workers leader in Ford's River Rouge plant; his appeal was supported by Ford Local 600, UAW.

Hugo DeGregory, a paper-factory worker in Hudson, N.H., was subpoenaed in 1954 by the state attorney general Louis C. Wyman who has power to act not only as a prosecutor but also as a one-man legislative committee. DeGregory invoked both First and Fifth Amendments in refusing to testify about his political beliefs or to name others. He was convicted of contempt and sentenced to 1 year in prison.

The U.S. Supreme Court by a 6 to 3 ruling in June, 1959 refused to review the conviction and in July, 1960, DeGregory entered the Merrimac County Jail at Boscawen, N.H., where his prison conditions were as severe as those imposed on Willard Uphaus. Released on bail, he appealed his case to the New Hampshire Supreme Court.

Harvey O'Connor, author and national chairman of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, refused to respond to a subpoena to appear before the HUAC September 5, 1958 in Newark, N.J., challenging the committee's right to exist. Subpoena was issued as he entered the hall to speak on behalf of others called by the committee. His trial was set for April, 1961.

Sidney Turoff, a steel worker in Buffalo, N.Y., summoned by the HUAC in October, 1957, stated that he himself had formerly been a Communist Party member but refused to identify others. Convicted in Federal Court, December 15, 1959, he was sentenced to 60 days and a fine of \$100. His conviction was appealed.

Braden Appeal: Carl Braden of Louisville, Ky., a field secretary

of the Southern Conference Educational Fund and editor of *The Southern Patriot*, had refused to cooperate with the HUAC at hearings in July, 1958, at Atlanta, Ga. He charged the committee was attacking integration workers under pretense of looking for "subversives." In Federal Court at Atlanta February 2, 1959, he was sentenced to a year's imprisonment but appealed his case. By a vote of 5 to 4, the U.S. Supreme Court February 27, 1961, upheld his conviction.

Test Cases: Appeal of Frank Wilkinson, Secretary of the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, was accepted for review by the U.S. Supreme Court, March 28, 1960. Twice subpoenaed by the HUAC, once in Los Angeles in 1956 and again in Atlanta, Ga., in July, 1958 he declined to answer questions other than his name, challenging the constitutionality of the committee under the First Amendment. He had gone to Atlanta to help in defense of integration leaders. Convicted of contempt in January, 1959, he was sentenced to 1 year in prison. He had been active in the movement to abolish the HUAC. On February 27, 1961, the Supreme Court by a vote of 5 to 4 upheld his contempt conviction.

Dr. Bernard Deutch, physicist, was a graduate student when subpoenaed in April, 1954 by the HUAC. He answered questions about his own past membership in the Communist Party but invoked the First Amendment in refusing to answer about others. Sentenced to 90 days (suspended) and a fine of \$100, he appealed the conviction to Supreme Court which accepted it for review in October, 1960.

UN-AMERICAN COMMITTEE EXPOSED

Rep. James Roosevelt (D., Calif.) spoke in the House of Representatives, April 25, 1960 on "the necessity and responsibility of this body to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities." He stated: "I am convinced that the major activity of the Committee which we have licensed is the abridgement of the citizen's freedoms. . . . It has become an agency for the destruction of human dignity and constitutional rights. . . .

"Those who would answer the charges against themselves are forced to accuse others and become the agents of further havoc. It is, I think, a monstrous thing that we have created such an institution and lent it our powers and prestige. . . . We have no mandate to abuse the rights and feelings of our citizens. . . . The essence of the Com-

mittee's work is itself name-calling. . . . We need only break that spell of anxiety to find wide support for the abolition of this thoroughly bad institution."

The National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee was formed in mid-1960. Aubrey Williams, president of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, is temporary chairman; headquarters are in Los Angeles. As the 87th Congress opened in January, 1961 an advertisement calling for abolition of the HUAC appeared in the *New York Times* with over 400 signatures. The list included 48 Protestant ministers (9 of them bishops), 18 rabbis, and 133 professors and education leaders. Wisconsin Governor Gaylord A. Nelson urged Congressmen to vote against continuation of the HUAC as a standing committee.

The committee's investigating fund in fiscal 1960 totaled \$327,000 and (by a vote of 412 to 6) was raised to \$331,000 in fiscal 1961. Speaking against the appropriation were Roosevelt and William F. Ryan (N.Y.). And voting with them against the measure were 4 other courageous Democrats—Edith Green (Ore.), Barratt O'Hara (Ill.), Thomas L. Ashley (Ohio) and Robert Kastenmeier (Wisc.). For the 2-year period, January 4, 1959 to December 31, 1960 this committee spent \$616,121. This large fund provided the committee opportunity to publicize its contempt for the legal rights of its victims.

In California: The Committee took itself to San Francisco in May, 1960, to inquire into alleged communism in northern California. When its hearings at City Hall were held May 12-13, some 400 students from University of California and from San Francisco State College marched in a protest demonstration against it. Fire-hoses were turned on demonstrators when they tried to enter the hall.

Club-swinging policemen charged the students, slugged girls and young women and hurled them down a long flight of marble stairs. The day became known as Black Friday, the 13th. At the hearings Barbara Hartle and another informer told their usual stories but all other witnesses challenged the committee and refused to answer questions. Although 62 demonstrators had been arrested and charged with "rioting," all cases against them were dismissed on June 1.

Seamen Called: For its hearings in Washington, D.C., June 6-8, 1960, the committee had subpoenaed 50 seamen, including Capt. Hugh Mulzac, captain of an American merchant ship during World War II and first Negro to be given such a command. After 8 seamen had

been heard, a clerk brought to chairman Francis E. Walter (D., Pa.) a copy of the *Washington Post*, with a detailed exposure of the committee's extravagant expense accounts. Walter without explanation hastily adjourned the hearings.

Walter had called the hearings to promote his bill that would remove from employment on any U.S. merchant ship any seaman refusing to answer the questions of any congressional committee. It would force merchant seamen to become informers. The bill was opposed by the Seamen's Defense Committee which struggled for 4 years against screening of merchant seamen for political purposes by the Coast Guard. In February, 1960 the defense committee won its legal battle in the courts, enabling screened seamen again to earn their living as seamen.

"Operation Abolition": In an attempt to label all criticism of it as "communist-inspired," the committee in 1960 sponsored a smear film full of flagrant distortions of fact, called "Operation Abolition," and tried to promote it in educational, religious and other circles. On February 24, 1961 the National Council of Churches' general board warned the churches across the nation not to show this film unless an opportunity is provided to correct its distortions. The Council consists of 34 Protestant denominations, representing about 40 million members. (For a full analysis of HUAC, see *Congressional Pillory*, by Frank Donner.)

McCARRAN ACT APPEAL

The Communist Party of the U.S. in its appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court on October 11, 1960, charged that the Internal Security Act of 1950 (McCarran Act) violates the 1st Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guaranteeing free speech and free assembly. The case was argued for the defense by Attorneys John J. Abt and Joseph Forer.

Registration required under the Act as amended by the Communist Control Act of 1954, would in effect outlaw the Party, the brief charged. "Congressional committees and loyalty boards have blasted the reputations and ruined the careers of hundreds of individuals and frightened thousands of others into silence by using precisely the same criteria to identify and expose "Communists," the brief declared.

The Subversive Activities Control Act which is Title I of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the petition stated, is designed especially

to reach "peaceable advocacy and innocent association . . . since there is a plethora of other laws which punish seditious acts and advocacy and provide for the registration of foreign agents."

Representing the Communist Party, Abt argued that the law represented "an attempt without precedent in this country to enforce conformity by suppressing association and advocacy." He said the purpose and effect of the law was to discourage the free speech and association protected by the 1st Amendment. And there had never been sufficient proof to show that the CP was in fact controlled from abroad.

The U.S. Court of Appeals on July 30, 1959, upheld in a 2 to 1 decision SACB's order that the CP must register under the Act. Judge David L. Brazelon dissented from the majority opinion. He held that the government had never opened the record of the Louis Budenz testimony to examination by the Party, and that the Board's report still rested on a finding which the court had ordered stricken out in 1954.

The 1960 appeal was the second time this CP case had been before the Supreme Court. In April, 1956, the high court had sent the case back to the SACB because it was based on the tainted testimony of perjurers.

TAFT-HARTLEY PERSECUTIONS

Mine-Mill Cases: The U.S. Supreme Court on January 16, 1961, voided the conviction of Maurice E. Travis, former Secretary-Treasurer of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers. Travis was convicted in February, 1958 of signing a false non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act. Sentenced to 8 years in prison and fined \$4,000, he appealed to higher courts. In his petition to the Supreme Court, Travis' defense offered evidence that Fred Gardner, a witness in the case, had lied and given perjured testimony, as he had also in the Cleveland Taft-Hartley case.

When Travis' case was accepted for review by the Supreme Court, the Mine-Mill union postponed their appeal on behalf of 9 union leaders convicted in a separate case of "conspiracy" to file false T-H affidavits. In Federal District Court, Denver, March 14, 1960, the 9 present and former Mine-Mill leaders (including Travis) were sentenced to prison terms and heavy fines. Of these, 7 were sentenced to 3 years and \$2,000 fines, while 2 received 18-month sentences and \$1,500 fines. They had been convicted on December 17, 1959.

During 1960 major unions representing some 2.5 million workers expressed support for Mine-Mill's defense in this frame-up case. The *International Teamster* (Sept. 1960) pointed out that the "conspiracy" charge against a union is as old as the labor movement itself. It added: "The anti-labor hysteria created by the McClellan committee and the rigged campaign that brought passage of the Landrum-Griffin law gave the Justice Department the opportunity to crack down on Mine-Mill, otherwise it would never have dared to undertake so obvious a union-busting move in the middle of a major strike." The Amalgamated Clothing Workers carried a similar protest in its official organ.

Ohio Seven: On February 20, 1961 the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the convictions in this case. The 7 had been sentenced in February, 1958, to 18 months in prison and fines of \$2,500 each for "conspiracy" to violate the Taft-Hartley Act's clause on non-Communist affidavits. Two former trade union leaders, Marie Reed Haug, who had been a local business agent for Electrical Workers (UE), and her husband Fred Haug, a former local president of Mine-Mill, were charged with signing false affidavits. Marie Haug testified she had resigned from the Communist Party a full year before she signed her first T-H affidavit in 1950.

Convicted of "conspiring" with them were 5 others, Eric J. Reinthaler, Hyman Lumer, James F. West, Sam Reed and Andrew Remes. After the Supreme Court had begun to overrule the Justice Department in the Smith Act cases, this new tactic of charging "conspiracy" against trade union leaders was started in the mid-1950's.

SMITH ACT MEMBERSHIP CLAUSE

Under the membership clause of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, known as the Smith Act, the cases of Junius Irving Scales of North Carolina and John Francis Noto of Buffalo, N. Y., were before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1960. Other similar cases, pending in federal district courts, include those of Claude Lightfoot of Chicago, Albert Blumberg of N.Y. and Philadelphia, Michael Russo of Boston, John Hellman of Montana and Max Weiss of N.Y. All will be affected by a Supreme Court decision in the Scales and Noto cases.

A section of the Smith Act prohibits the organizing of groups to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of the government. The membership clause makes it a crime merely to be a member of such a

group. This prohibition has been interpreted by the Justice Department to apply to the Communist Party of the U.S. However, in dismissing the case of William Schneiderman in 1943, the Supreme Court ruled that the Party "desired to achieve its purpose by peaceful and democratic means." There has never been any evidence to prove that the Party advocates forcible overthrow of the government.

The Department of Justice charges that Scales and Noto were both former leaders of the Party and not mere casual members. Attorneys for the two challenge the constitutionality of the Smith Act on the ground that it violates the 1st Amendment guaranteeing free speech and free assembly.

CRUEL TREATMENT OF WINSTON

The Negro Communist leader and Smith Act defendant, Henry Winston, on November 7, 1960, filed suit in federal court in New York against the U.S. government, charging it with negligence and wrong diagnosis of a brain tumor. While imprisoned in the federal penitentiary at Terre Haute, Ind. in April, 1959 he had suffered from dizziness and failing vision. But for 10 months the prison authorities dismissed his case as "malingerer" until protests became so widespread they could not be ignored.

Not until January, 1960, was Winston finally taken to a hospital for treatment. By a 7-hour operation his life was saved but he was left partially paralyzed and blind. After treatment for 5 months in the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital on Staten Island, he regained the use of his limbs but remains totally blind. Despite all protests, he was transferred in October, 1960, to the federal prison at Danbury, Conn. He has already served more than 5 years of a total sentence of 8 years.

SOBELL APPEAL

Morton Sobell, arrested August 16, 1950 and convicted of "conspiracy to commit espionage" with Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, was still imprisoned at the beginning of 1961 in federal penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga. But his cause was "being espoused by a varied—and increasingly respectable—body of opinion," (*The Nation*, Nov. 12, 1960.)

Judge Irving R. Kaufman had sentenced Sobell on April 5, 1951, to

30 years in prison, although as judge in the case he had admitted: "The evidence in the case did not point to any activity on your part in connection with the atom-bomb project."

In a national appeal for commutation of Sobell's sentence during the traditional Christmas amnesty period in 1960, a group of theologians, law professors and others, headed by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary, stated: "No specific item of information supposed to have been secured by him or transmitted by him to anyone else is specified in the record. The case against him, therefore, is vague in content and slender in proof."

A resolution of the 1960 convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, in Detroit urged the president of the U.S. to review the case. Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel prize winner in chemistry, stated: "I am astounded at how little there was about Sobell in the trial. You cannot tell what he is even supposed to have done." (Quoted in *National Appeal for Freedom*, Nov. 1960.)

The Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell, convened 1,800 persons in Washington, D.C., November 19-21, 1960, to join in the request for commutation of sentence.

RIGHTS OF NONCITIZENS

The noncitizen population in the U.S. today exceeds three million persons. Their status in this country is governed by the Immigration & Nationality Act of 1952 (Walter-McCarran Act), many times denounced as discriminatory and oppressive, but still basic U.S. policy on immigration, naturalization and deportation.

U.S. Supreme Court and other court decisions, generally upholding citizens' civil rights and constitutional liberties, have somewhat tempered administration of the immigration law. In recent years the Immigration & Naturalization Service's treatment of noncitizens has become less abusive.

However, the Walter-McCarran Act remains largely untouched. The national origin and quota system, with its built-in discriminatory practices against race, color, creed and nationality, still governs who may be admitted to the U.S. Political beliefs and association are still used as grounds for expelling noncitizens irrespective of the number of years lived in the U.S.

In 1959 Congress amended the law to enable a noncitizen whose presence in the U.S. was unlawful but who had resided here continuously since June 28, 1940, to acquire permanent legal status. Excepted from this legislation is the noncitizen who had ever been a member of or affiliated with the Communist Party. Theoretically, a noncitizen who has been free of membership taint for at least 10 years should be able under the immigration law to secure "forgiveness" for such past membership and suspension of deportation. In practice the service negates the section of the law demanding of the non-citizen not only the statutory requisite of 10 years non-belief and non-association but proof of a changed attitude by a willingness to be "cooperative" as an informer.

Deportations: Supreme Court decisions in the past two years have not served to liberalize the immigration law, nor lighten the enforcement hand of the Service. In the Abel case involving the trial of a Soviet citizen for espionage, the court sanctioned, 5 to 4, the use by the FBI of "an administrative warrant [of arrest for deportation issued by the Service] to make an arrest for criminal investigation both in violation of section 342 of the Immigration & Nationality Act and in violation of the Bill of Rights," meaning the 4th amendment against unlawful search and seizure and the 5th amendment against self incrimination.

In the Niukkanen case the Supreme Court, 5 to 4, permitted deportation of "a man who has lived here for every meaningful month of his entire life" [since two months old], sending him "into exile for acts [past membership] which the record reveals were utterly devoid of any sinister implication." Four of the judges held this case similar to the Rowoldt case in which the court had declared that the offense of Communist Party membership to be deportable must be a "meaningful association." The majority chose not to disturb the lower court's ruling that Niukkanen had not originally confessed his membership to the Service and had committed perjury when he subsequently testified he had not *knowingly* been a member. It was apparently deduced that his membership was meaningful.

By a divided decision the Supreme Court in the Lehman and the Mulcahey cases reversed a series of favorable lower court decisions that held safe from deportation those noncitizens who had acquired a non-deportable status under immigration laws antedating the Walter-McCarran Act.

In June 1960 the Supreme Court, in *Kimm v. Rosenberg* approved the Service's practice of drawing adverse inferences from the use of the 5th amendment. When invoked by a noncitizen seeking any relief from deportation under the law, where discretionary power rests with the Attorney General to grant or deny the relief, the Service refused to accept it.

In *Fleming v. Nestor*, the court again, 5 to 4, ruled that an alien, deported on a charge of past membership, could be deprived of his social security benefits, although at the time of his deportation he was past 65 years of age and subsisting on these benefits after 43 years of labor in the U.S. Thus, it is now constitutionally proper to cast the aged noncitizen into exile, bereft of the old age security he had earned through a lifetime of work.

The death of William Heikkila in 1959 ended deportation proceedings against him. In 1958 while court litigation, contesting his deportability, was still in progress, the government secretly deported him to Finland. But an outraged court and indignant public forced the Service to return him to the U.S. During the continued deportation proceedings and harassment Heikkila was suddenly stricken and died of a heart attack.

Hamish Scott MacKay, a carpenter, 55 years old and a descendant on his mother's side from a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was deported to Canada on November 18, 1960. The Supreme Court by 5 to 4 refused to stay his deportation. On the same day, William Mackie, a painter, 51 years old, who had been in the U.S. since he was 8 months old, was deported to Finland. As in the MacKay case, the high court, 5 to 4, refused to stay the deportation.

Denaturalization: In the past 2 years many denaturalization actions were dismissed as having been instituted defectively, without an affidavit showing good cause for the suit. For example, in the *Matles* case the Supreme Court held such an affidavit to be indispensable. Similarly the Court in its *Nowak-Maisenber*g decision in 1958 curbed denaturalization actions where the basis for such suits was failure to disclose Communist Party membership under former naturalization laws. More recently in the *Chaunt* case the Court refused to cancel citizenship acquired many years before, where the government charged a concealment of arrests that occurred more than five years before the grant of naturalization and not then a bar to citizenship.

Supervisory Parole: In the *Witkovich* and *Sentner* cases the Supreme

Court curbed the Service's control over a deportee whose deportation it could not effect. Control was limited to such supervision as was necessary to inform the Attorney General of the deportee's whereabouts. Following these cases the Service imposed a travel restriction requiring the deportee to notify it 48 hours in advance of any intent to go beyond a highly circumscribed area. The Court of Appeals, in *Siminoff v. Esperdy* voided the regulation as unreasonably oppressive.

Statute of Limitations: Liberals and other groups are now demanding legislation to bar deportation proceedings against the non-citizen who has lived in the U.S. for many years. The Democratic Party in its 1960 Platform asserted that a revision of the Walter-McCarran Act was imperative. In such revision "the protections provided by due process, right of appeal, *and statutes of limitations*, can be extended to non-citizens without hampering the security of our nation."

The American Bar Association, in its 1960 convention, called for enactment of a "ten year statute of limitation within which deportation proceedings must be instituted." Several bills introduced into Congress to revise generally the Walter-McCarran Act also contained sections to foreclose deportation, for any reason, of a non-citizen who came to the U.S. as a child of 14 years or under, or who has lived in this country for 15 years.

The American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born and other groups are urging adoption of a 5-year statute of limitations against deportation. Such legislation would provide that no person who had lived here continuously for 5 years after legal entry may be deported. Similiar legislation is planned to bar denaturalization actions after the expiration of 5 years from the grant of citizenship.

Abner Green: The American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born suffered a great loss when Abner Green died on September 5, 1959, at the age of 46. He had been executive secretary of the committee for 17 years. Attorney Royal W. France, a sponsor of the committee, wrote of him: "Abner Green was a dedicated man . . . a man dedicated to a great and noble cause to which he gave his great talents without stint and without limit. The tributes paid to him by the many foreign born among us, whom he served so unselfishly and often so successfully, are not the perfunctory praise often given when one has gone but are heartfelt and heart warming expressions at the loss of a true friend."

DISMISSAL OF TEACHERS

In New York City, October 18, 1960 the Board of Education held a special meeting to give 5 teachers and a school principal a final hearing on their case before passing judgment on their suspensions from the school system. Kings County Judge Louis Goldstein who sat as examiner in a departmental trial in January and April, 1960, recommended in June that they be dismissed for allegedly making false statements about past membership in the Communist Party. Most of the negative answers were given during the 1940's on applications for licenses. Three were suspended in September 1955 for refusing to inform on others, and three were suspended in January 1960 solely on the false answer charge.

At the Board of Education special hearing, lawyers for the accused charged that other teachers who had given the same false answers had not been penalized if they informed on their colleagues. Judge Goldstein, they argued, had refused to order the Board to produce its confidential files on teachers who had not been suspended although they had lied about past membership. The attorneys contended that disciplinary action was taken only against those teachers who had refused to inform, and this fact proved that the false answer charge was an indirect way of evading the ruling by State Education Commissioner James E. Allen Jr., in 1956, upheld by the Court of Appeals in 1959, that a Board of Education has no right to compel a teacher to inform on associates.

In New Jersey the state Supreme Court in July 1960 unanimously reversed the dismissal of Robert Lowenstein, a Newark language department chairman. His case was remanded for new hearing by the Board of Education. But on September 20, 1960, the board again voted to dismiss Dr. Lowenstein; this was the third time the Newark board had dismissed him.

Originally dismissed in 1955, Dr. Lowenstein was retried in 1957 on the basis of the *Slochower* decision by the U.S. Supreme Court. In handing down its 1960 decision, the state Supreme Court criticized the school board for the "inordinate amount of time" already consumed in this case. Dr. Lowenstein is a leader of the American Federation of Teachers in Newark and in the state, and one of the editors of the *New Jersey Teacher*.

In the Philadelphia cases, the Pennsylvania State Supreme Court

on June 30, 1960, ordered the city Board of Education to reinstate 4 teachers who had been dismissed in 1954. They had refused to answer questions before the House Un-American Activities Committee. Three of the teachers had invoked the 5th Amendment while a fourth teacher, Mrs. Goldie Watson, had invoked the 1st Amendment. The state court said that the dismissals of these teachers "denied them due process, contrary to the 14th Amendment of the Constitution."

After the state Supreme Court ruling in June, 1960, the Philadelphia Board of Education then appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court which declined on December 5, 1960, to review the case, thus sustaining the state court's decision. The board then announced that the four teachers would be reinstated, with back pay less any money earned during the period. With the support of the Teachers Union of Philadelphia (Ind.), the teachers 6-year legal battle was won.

LOYALTY OATHS

Under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, a college student seeking a federal loan must take an oath of allegiance to the U.S. and must also sign an affidavit that he does not support or belong to an organization that favors "the overthrow of the U.S. government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

Widespread opposition to such a loyalty oath requirement has developed during the past 2 years. A growing number of institutions of higher education, including Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Chicago, and several of the leading women's colleges, refused to participate in the government's loan program because of this disclaimer clause. On June 16, 1960, the U.S. Senate reaffirmed its decision to drop the affidavit requirement.

The *New York Times*, June 17, 1960 editorially commented: "The Senate thinks the nation will survive if the student takes the oath of allegiance but does not sign the affidavit." Under the compromise, however, loan applicants would still be required to take an oath of allegiance. The American Civil Liberties Union considered the oath was "unnecessary and discriminatory."

The Senate amendment provided that no one might apply for or get a loan while a member of the Communist Party or of any organization having for one of its purposes the seizure of government through force and violence. Also, that no person who has been a member of

such an organization within 5 years should seek or receive aid unless he files a sworn statement on his membership. Any person violating either of these provisions would be fined up to \$10,000 or imprisoned up to 5 years or both. Despite this concession to reaction the bill to delete the affidavit died in the House Education and Labor Committee.

In 33 states, public school teachers are required to take an oath of allegiance or otherwise to satisfy the employing agencies that they are loyal to the U.S. government. Information on these laws is available in the National Education Association's research monograph, *The Teacher and the Law*.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1960

The Civil Rights Act of 1960, a weak measure supposed "to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes," was passed by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower, May 6, 1960. Designed principally to extend federal protection of Negro voting rights in the South, the Act has been attacked as failing even in that limited purpose.

The measure provides a new device for "voting referees" supposedly to help Negroes to register in southern areas where they have been excluded from voting. When he has trouble in registering, the Negro may go to the referee and then if he can show that he meets the state's qualifications, he may be registered.

This roundabout referee provision makes it harder not easier for Negroes to vote, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People charged. It calls the Act a "fraud," and its attorney, Thurgood Marshall, states, "It would take two or three years for a good lawyer to get someone registered under this bill." (*N. Y. Times*, April 22, 1960.) He said Congressional action in such "dribblets" as the 1957 and 1960 laws might serve only to hold off the needed strong measures.

Other liberal and Negro groups attacked the 1960 Act on two grounds: it did not go beyond the voting issue, and even there the remedy provided is useless. Rev. Martin Luther King, leader of the successful bus boycott in Alabama in 1955-56, speaking before the National Urban League in New York, September 6, 1960, charged that both Democrats and Republicans were "hypocritical" on civil rights. He said that both parties had missed "a marvellous opportunity" to demonstrate their good faith because they failed to pass civil rights legisla-

tion in the post-convention session of Congress. "The fact remains, however," he said, "that the issue of racial injustice cannot be successfully evaded, nor will it disappear with double-talk."

NAACP Program: In place of pussyfooting on civil rights the NAACP calls for a program of vigorous action "to end segregation or other forms of discrimination in all federal or federally-aided housing programs and to establish a commission with sufficient funds and authority to implement the order. To insure equal job opportunity in all employment resulting from federal grants, loans, subsidies, contracts and licenses. To insure equal access to all public employment services, hospitals, schools, parks, and eating and waiting room facilities in airports, courthouses, etc., resulting from federal assistance programs."

NEGRO SIT-IN DEMONSTRATIONS

Four young Negro college freshmen on February 1, 1960, sat down at a Woolworth store "whites-only" lunch counter in Greensboro, N. C., and asked for "a cup of coffee, please." Their action started a movement against segregation in eating places in all parts of the South, with widespread support from many white students and other groups in northern states. Some of the demonstrations were inter-racial.

After only 6 months, white merchants in 28 southern cities and counties in at least 14 states had desegregated their lunch counters, "without incident or reported business losses." (*N.Y. Times*, August 6, 1960.) This number included Greensboro where the demonstrations had started. It was later reported that lunch counters in 43 cities had integrated where formerly they were segregated.

Negroes had won permission to eat with whites in these cities, as a result of sit-ins and boycotts. In Houston, Texas, for example, 50 stores, including most of the big department stores, supermarkets and variety stores, had quietly integrated their lunch counters. On October 19, 1960, four of the major chains (Woolworth, Grant, Kress and McCrory) announced they had integrated lunch counters in 122 cities in southern and border states.

These gains were made despite many arrests of demonstrators and, in some cases, violence used against the Negro students and others. Nearly 1,600 students were arrested during the first 3 months of the demonstrations. In Jacksonville, Fla. in August Negro students who had been sitting quietly at lunch counters for a week were attacked by a mob

of some 100 whites wielding axe-handles and baseball bats. Some carried Confederate flags. Policemen stood by and offered no protection for those attacked. Violence continued for several hours until firemen with hoses cleared the area. One Negro was killed and many were injured. Of 130 persons arrested and jailed, at least two-thirds were Negroes.

Buyers' strikes and boycotts of stores were carried out by Negroes in Jacksonville and a number of other southern cities during August and September, 1960. Rich's big department store and A & P grocery stores were boycotted in Atlanta, Ga., and similar action was taken in Oklahoma City, Okla., and Savannah, Ga.

Atlanta Demonstrations: Widespread sit-in demonstrations in Atlanta, Ga. (not included among cities that had integrated lunch counters), started October 19, 1960. College students and others sought service at lunch counters in Rich's and other shops. During the first two days of demonstrations, 75 persons were arrested, including Dr. King.

Persecuted because of his fearless leadership, Dr. King was sentenced to four months in prison and then transferred to the Georgia State Prison at Reidsville, Ga. He had previously been fined and given a suspended sentence for driving without a Georgia driver's license. In the sit-in case it was charged that he violated his probation set in the earlier case. Widespread protests resulted in his release on bail pending appeal. But in November, 1960, he was denied the right to vote in the presidential elections, because it was charged that he had not paid the poll tax required in Alabama.

Support from Organizations: Known as CORE, the Congress of Racial Equality was active in Greenville, S.C., and in other parts of the South in leading a "non-violent, direct action approach to race relations." While the sit-in demonstrations were started spontaneously by local students, they gained the support of CORE, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed by Dr. King. CORE published an excellent summary, *Sit Ins: The Students Report* (1960).

The NAACP took full responsibility for providing legal defense to protect the rights of Negro students arrested for their part in sit-in demonstrations. It maintained a team of 70 lawyers throughout the South, working under its attorney Thurgood Marshall, to represent those arrested. Fines and jail sentences against student demonstrators were appealed. Sit-in demonstrations continued through the year 1960.

The non-violent spirit of the sit-in protests was shown in the code

drawn up by college students in Nashville, Tenn., to guide the students' conduct, on the basis of Dr. King's teachings. It read:

"Don't strike back or curse if abused. Don't laugh out. Don't hold conversations with floor workers. Don't block entrances to the stores and the aisles. Show yourself courteous and friendly at all times. Sit straight and always face the counter. Remember love and non-violence."

The American Federation of Teachers on August 19, 1960, at its annual meeting in Dayton, Ohio, passed a resolution calling on all teachers and others to support the sit-in demonstrations as "peaceable expression of protest by young people against environmental handicaps as they seek self-respect, recognition and dignity."

The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice on August 28, 1960, at its meeting in St. Louis, Mo., passed a resolution urging Roman Catholics to take part in sit-in demonstrations and other forms of peaceful protest against racial segregation. The conference also urged Pres. Eisenhower to order an end to discrimination in administration of federal aid, and asked Congress to pass legislation outlawing racial discrimination in housing.

Kneel-In and Other Protests: In an extension of the sit-in campaign, Negroes in several southern cities started "kneel-in" demonstrations in all-white churches. In New Orleans, La., for example on September 18, 4 Negroes walked into a white Baptist church and listened to a sermon attacking the kneel-in protests. Other Negroes entered other white Protestant churches in the area.

In Greenville, S.C., a number of anti-segregation demonstrations were held in July. In one such protest, 8 Negroes were arrested after a sit-in at the Public Library. In these Greenville demonstrations, white students joined with the Negroes and led protests at chain-store lunch counters.

At Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., Rev. J. Robert Nelson, dean of the divinity school, and 10 faculty members resigned May 30, 1960 in protest against the school's refusal to readmit Rev. Robert Lawson, a Negro minister who had been expelled for leading Negro students in a lunch-counter sit-in. Several graduates, including 3 Negroes, returned their diplomas in protest, while a number of undergraduates withdrew from the divinity school.

In the North: In New Rochelle, N. Y., in September, 1960 at the William B. Ward School, 23 Negroes started a sit-down in protest

against the exclusion of Negro children from the all-white school. At the downtown Lincoln School district, 93% of the children were Negroes.

As a result of the sit-down, 8 Negroes were arrested. First to be tried was a local leader of the NAACP. On November 14, 1960, the disorderly conduct charges against all 8 were dismissed in City Court.

A suit in federal court to further integration resulted in a decision that Lincoln School must desegregate no later than the 1961-62 school year. The judge found that the Board of Education had created it as a segregated school. His ruling, which is being appealed to a higher court, allowed 14 children to transfer to predominantly white schools.

Rev. Ashton Jones: After leading a sit-in demonstration to protest segregation in restaurants in Marshall, Texas, a white Methodist minister and pacifist, Rev. Ashton Jones, was arrested April 18, 1960. In an interview with him in December, 1960, it was reported that for practicing "the brotherhood of man under the Kingdom of God," he had been "jailed 19 times, given the sweat-box treatment, pushed down a flight of stairs, beaten with a rawhide whip, had his face cracked open, and almost drowned." (*Nation*, Dec. 24, 1960.) Members of the White Citizens Councils had taken part in the persecutions. At Shreveport, La., in the City Court, June 10, 1960, he was tried, convicted of "disturbing the peace and vagrancy" and sentenced to 8 months on a prison farm. Segregationist prisoners beat him unmercifully while guards looked on. When he came to Shreveport in January, 1961 to appeal his conviction, he was again arrested. But on January 25, 1961, he was acquitted in City Court and released.

INTEGRATION IN SCHOOLS

Six years after the historic Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, outlawing racial segregation in public schools, desegregation in the 11 genuinely southern states was still proceeding only at a snail's pace, described as a crawl. With the opening of the school year in September, 1960, the total number of desegregated schools had risen to 767, less than one-third of the 2,833 southern districts with a Negro school population. Only 6.3% of Negro school children were in integrated schools—an increase of only 0.3% over the previous year. (Southern Education Reporting Service.)

Just 17 new school districts accepted Negro children in previously

all-white schools in the autumn of 1960. In most cases a pitiful few were admitted. Richmond, Va. took two. In Dollarway, Ark., one little first-grader "fearfully went *alone*," the NAACP reported.

Out of a Negro school population of 3 million in southern states, there were about 182,000 in schools with whites. But in 4 states, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and Southern Carolina, there was no desegregation; they have yet to admit a single Negro child to an all-white school. In Atlanta, Ga., schools were under federal court order to integrate in September, 1961.

In Border States: The *Southern School News* reported in 1960 that the border areas, including Washington, D.C., parts of Maryland (notably Baltimore), urban Delaware, West Virginia, Oklahoma, Missouri, and parts of Kentucky each had at least 10,000 Negro pupils in integrated situations. This had resulted largely from voluntary acceptance of integration by these states following the Supreme Court order. But only in these border states was Negro attendance in integrated schools higher than 2%.

In Delaware, integration was proceeding at the rate of a grade-a-year, but the Federal Court of Appeals in Philadelphia ruled this was too slow, integration must be complete by September, 1961. U.S. Supreme Court upheld this ruling by refusing to review it.

Token Compliance: In 5 southern states, Arkansas, Tennessee, North Carolina, Florida and Virginia, not more than 1% of Negro children were attending white schools in 1960. While these 5 states had a Negro school population of over 957,000, less than 1% were benefiting from the high court's 1954 decision. In North Carolina in the autumn of 1960, only 77 Negro children were in schools with white children.

In Virginia, Negroes attended schools with whites for the first time in Richmond and Roanoke. But not more than 200 Negroes in the whole state were in mixed schools and only 10 of the state's 129 school districts were integrated.

In Arkansas 102 Negroes were attending school with whites in 9 school districts. In Tennessee, Knoxville began the grade-a-year plan, but Chattanooga had won a year's delay. By 1960 Florida, where, in several districts, court actions were brought against the pupil placement plan, had 829 Negroes in schools with white pupils. Two of these schools were in the Miami area.

In New Orleans, La., die-hard segregationists tried to prevent the

integration of schools on November 14, 1960, the date set for desegregation by order of Federal Judge James Skelly Wright. On that day, 4 young Negro girls entered schools previously segregated. They succeeded despite jeers, insults, and the combined efforts of Gov. James Davis, legislators of the state assembly, the state superintendent of schools, and a force of state police, all arrayed to stop them. The local board of education had deferred, however reluctantly, to the federal laws and court decisions.

But violent demonstrations by White Citizens' Council elements continued in New Orleans and succeeded in delaying integration. In a furor of "economic lynching" the segregationists brought pressure against the Negroes. The father of one Negro 6-year old who had entered the white school was, for that reason, fired from his job. In an editorial, the *N. Y. Times* commented: "The frenzied effort of segregationist demagogues in Baton Rouge and a racist rabble in New Orleans to subvert the Constitution and substitute anarchy for law is as degrading and dangerous a thing as has happened in our country since the events in Little Rock three years ago."

On March 20, 1961 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the local efforts of segregationists to suspend school integration were unconstitutional. It voided an "Interposition Act" which had been put through the Louisiana Legislature in order to prevent desegregation. The high court reaffirmed the board of education's right to carry out integration plans. A white boycott of the integrated schools had continued into 1961.

In Other Areas: In Houston, Texas, 42,500 Negro and 127,000 white public school pupils make it the largest segregated school district in the U.S. Integration in Houston is scheduled to proceed on a grade-a-year basis which provides that each first-grade pupil in 1960 may choose to enroll either at the formerly all-white school or the formerly all-Negro school in the area. In 1961 the choice will be open to first and second grade pupils and so on, until by 1971 integration will be completed.

In Little Rock, Ark., where violent attacks by whites occurred in 1957, (see *Labor Fact Book 14*, p. 110), 12 Negro students in September, 1960, peacefully entered both Central and Hall High Schools. At Clinton, Tenn. 12 Negro students entered a new high school building where the old one had been dynamited by segregationists in October 1958.

The Southern Regional Council reported in August 1960 that the South's attitude of massive resistance to integration had resulted in a massive determination expressed in the students sit-in-movement to hasten the pace of desegregation. The Council declared: "The sit-ins succeeded, as nothing else had, in causing white southerners to see Negro southerners as individuals. This is, after all, the crux of the case for desegregation of schools; that the Negro child be regarded and treated as an individual." Pres. L. H. Foster of Tuskegee Institute reported in January, 1961, that the sit-in movement by Negro college students was "the major new ingredient" in race relations in 1960.

University of Georgia: Under a court order, the University of Georgia at Athens, Ga. on January 9, 1961, opened its doors to Negro students for the first time in its 175-year history. Two Negroes, Charlayne Alberta Hunter, 18 years old, and Hamilton E. Holmes, 19 were enrolled, marking the first desegregation at any level in the state's public education system.

At first all went smoothly except for jeers and segregationist chanting. But on January 11 a mob of about 1,000, including some white students, Ku Klux Klansmen and other outsiders, in one of the worst riots against desegregation, stormed the dormitory where the Negro girl was housed. Rocks were thrown at dormitory windows while the Athens police "made no serious effort to break up the rioting until it was well under way." (*N. Y. Times*, Jan. 12, 1961.)

The two Negroes were temporarily suspended for their own protection but by court order they were readmitted two days later. By January 16 they were attending classes peacefully. A large number of the university faculty and student body upheld the policy of integration. Gov. Vandiver decided to adopt a system of local option in relation to integration, after he saw that the state legislature backed such a move and it was "the will of the people."

Report on Higher Education: The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on January 15, 1961, issued a report on "Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education." Not until the University of Georgia admitted the 2 Negro students, as noted above, had a single Negro ever attended the 49 public institutions of higher education for white students in 4 southern states—Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

"At least 86 of the 211 public higher-educational institutions, formerly for white students only, in the 17 southern states continued to

exclude Negro applicants on the ground of race in violation of the law of the land," the report said. Also, 118 of the 211 public colleges in the 17 southern and border states are today open to Negroes at least in theory. But few or no Negroes may actually attend supposedly integrated institutions. *Southern School News* reports only 54 Negroes at white institutions of higher education in Virginia, and 85 in North Carolina. In all the 17 states, perhaps 5,000 Negroes in 1961 were attending college or graduate school classes in institutions that have more than 500,000 white students.

The U.S. Government is actually subsidizing discrimination by giving financial aid to segregated colleges, the Civil Rights Commission found. "As to land-grant colleges particularly," it reported, "the Federal Government has been heavily involved, not only because of its sponsorship of separate colleges . . . but because it has allowed southern legislatures to channel almost all federal funds for specific programs in such institutions to the separate white colleges. . . . It is not sound policy for the Federal Government to subsidize the unconstitutional operations of others; to do directly what is not permitted to do indirectly."

Rev. Martin Luther King, discussing various ways by which the President could, without additional legislation, hasten integration, pointed out in *The Nation*, Feb. 4, 1961: "The federal government is the nation's highest investor in segregation."

NEGROES' VOTING RIGHTS

The federal Civil Rights Commission established in 1957 reported in 1960 that voting rights were still denied to at least 1,750,000 adult Negroes in eleven southern states. American Heritage Foundation considers this a modest estimate. *Congressional Quarterly* puts it at 4 million. Denials of voting rights take many forms including legal obstacles, administrative technicalities and the threat of economic reprisals and physical harm.

The 14th Amendment (sec.2) of the U.S. Constitution provides that when the right to vote in any federal or state election is denied to any male citizen (over 21) the representation of that state in Congress shall be correspondingly reduced. Prof. Thomas I. Emerson and Arthur E. Bondfield of Yale University Law School call this provision the "forgotten remedy for the voteless Negro." (*The Nation*, Jan. 21, 1961.)

The same requirement is contained in an almost unknown statute

passed in 1872 and still on the books. But neither the Constitutional provision nor the statute has ever been successfully invoked to reduce the representation of any state in Congress. Emerson and Bondfield conclude: "This failure to adhere to the plain language of our Constitution and law is a continuing national scandal."

On September 13, 1960, the Department of Justice in U.S. District Court at Memphis, filed suit under the Civil Rights Act of 1957 charging 22 persons and two banks with using economic pressure to prevent Negroes from voting in Haywood County, Tenn., This was the first time the government had invoked the Act to halt economic pressures by individuals.

While nearly all of the county's 6,500 white persons of voting age were registered, the government found that fewer than 300 of the 7,921 eligible Negroes were registered. The suit charged that the defendants had coerced potential Negro voters and induced merchants not to deal with those trying to register to vote, not to sell goods or services to them. The banks had refused credit or loans to the Negroes. Those trying to register had been fired from their jobs. All this intimidation followed formation of the Haywood County Civic and Welfare League.

Witnesses in Washington: Hearings on Negro voting rights were held in Washington, D.C. January 31, 1960 by the Volunteer Civil Rights Commission, set up as an unofficial body for "a free franchise in the South." Sponsored by 16 religious, civil rights, and Negro organizations in the South and in Washington, it was started after the federal Civil Rights Commission was barred by Louisiana state officials from examining voting records in Louisiana. The Washington hearings revealed that little had been done to implement proposals of the Civil Rights Commission on providing federal registrars to insure the right to vote.

Witnesses testifying at the hearings included Curry P. Boyd, a Negro schoolteacher from Haywood County, Tenn., who stated that for trying to register, he had lost his job as principal of the elementary school. It was reported that in Bienville Parish, Louisiana, 630 Negroes were purged from the voting lists, leaving only 26 eligible to vote.

Grafton R. Gray, a farmer from Charleston, Miss., testified he was turned down 3 times when he tried to pay his poll tax and register. He was told no Negroes could pay poll taxes in Tallahatchie County and that not one of the county's 19,000 Negroes is a registered voter.

After hearing 10 witnesses from Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee and North Carolina, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist clergyman in Washington, declared: "It is incredible to me that in 1960 men and women must come here in a democracy and ask for the privilege of voting."

Evicted for Registering: The government's suit charging persecution of Negro applicants in Fayette County, Tenn., followed efforts of Negro sharecroppers to organize and win voting privileges. John McFerren, a cotton farmer, told the Washington hearings of threats against his life after he had helped organize the Fayette County Civic & Welfare League in their long struggle for the right to vote.

Federal Bureau of Investigation men, after investigating McFerren reported on him to local sheriffs, and immediately after that his life was threatened. It was "common practice" for FBI men to turn over reports to local sheriffs. When farmers went to register, McFerren testified, the landlord would be called in to watch. If a tenant registered, the landlord made him move out of his house that very night.

Mass evictions of farm tenants and sharecroppers in Fayette and Haywood Counties, Tenn., during the winter of 1960-61 followed the Negroes' efforts to register and vote. The U.S. Court of Appeals ruled December 30, 1960, against any evictions in retaliation for registering and voting but allowed them "as a part of normal rearrangement of farming operations," thus giving landlords a free hand to evict. As evictions increased, 135 Negro families including 700 persons were looking for places to go.

In a tent city called "Freedom Village" near Somerville, Tenn., about 60 children and their Negro sharecropper parents lived through a bitter winter. The tent colony was supplied with food and other necessities through efforts of the Southern Conference Education Fund, an emergency relief committee of CORE, the Non-Violent Action Group in Washington, D.C., Packinghouse Workers and other unions and organizations. Such Freedom Villages in Tennessee have become symbols of southern Negroes' determination to win their struggle for equal rights.

Numbers Registered: In the U.S. as a whole, some 5.5 million Negroes had registered to vote in the 1960 elections, but this total represented only about 56% of the 9,998,000 Negroes of voting age. The majority (about 67%) of those registered were in the northern or border state cities.

In six southern states, Negroes of voting age represent a substantial proportion of all citizens of voting age, as follows: Mississippi, 36.4%; South Carolina, 31%; Louisiana, 29.3%; Alabama, 27.7%; Georgia, 26%; Tennessee, 14.3%. Yet these same states are the ones in which fewest eligible Negroes are registered to vote. In Senator Eastland's state, Mississippi, for example, only about 4% of Negroes of voting age are registered. (See also *Labor Fact Book* 14.)

The Department of Justice invoked the Civil Rights Act of 1960 for the first time May 9, 1960 by demanding voting registration records of 4 "cipher" counties in the South, counties in which no Negroes were registered to vote despite a large Negro population. The 4 counties were Wilcox, Ala., Webster, Ga., E. Carroll, La., McCormick, S. C., where, the D. of J. charged, "distinctions on basis of race or color have been made with respect to registration and voting."

In Macon County, Ga., a federal judge, March 17, 1961, ordered 64 Negroes registered as voters. The Justice Department had produced testimony and evidence that Negroes with college degrees had been turned down as voters while white applicants, some of them with little or no education, had been registered without question.

VI. POLITICAL AFFAIRS

THE EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

The 86th Congress held its first session from January 7 through September 15, 1959, while its second lasted from January 6 to September 1, 1960, adjourning, however, from early July to mid-August to permit the holding of the political nominating conventions.

Control of the Senate and House was Democratic (in the Senate by 66 to 34; in the House by 283 to 152), but as in the previous Congress the Republican Administration obtained bi-partisan support for its military and foreign aid measures.

Hawaii was voted into the Union as the 50th state in 1959 and subsequently elected a Republican and a Democrat to the Senate and a Democrat to the House.

Praising the work of the 1959 session, the *Wall Street Journal* (Sept. 16) boasted that under the leadership of Chairman Howard W. Smith (D., Va.) of the House Rules Committee, Congress had been able to "bottle up" legislation "to aid chronically depressed areas, help cities and towns build sewers and water plants, and to launch federal assistance for local school construction and teachers salaries." Also "for 2½ months, Mr. Smith was able to keep off the floor a major housing bill. . . . These pigeonholing and delaying tactics" were used against any legislation that this Southern Bourbon regarded as "liberal." He was given credit also for marshalling the "95 Democratic votes—about 85 of them from the South—that put over the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House."

The *AFL-CIO Reporter* said that the first session left "a trail of unfinished business." Some of the meager results of this session:

Housing: After President Eisenhower twice vetoed larger housing measures, Congress passed a cutdown compromise bill which included provision for only 37,000 public housing units and only \$50 million in federal loans to build housing for the elderly; also \$650 million over two years for urban renewal or slum clearance grants.

Highways: Instead of taking money for highways out of general funds, Congress accepted Eisenhower's proposal for a sales tax on gasoline, raising it another 1 cent a gallon from October 1.

Public works: Overriding a veto for the first time in the session, Congress passed a \$1.2 billion bill for flood control, navigation and reclamation projects. Congressmen's interest in funds for their own local districts helped to pass this measure.

Food surpluses: A labor-supported program for overseas distribution of surplus foods was passed, including grants in emergencies such as famines. It included also a domestic food-stamp plan at the discretion of Agricultural Secretary Benson who announced he had no intention of going ahead with the program.

Anti-labor bill: The Landrum-Griffin bill was passed in September—a union curbing measure. This was considered the biggest victory for the bi-partisan anti-labor forces since enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947. The new Act virtually outlawed any kind of secondary boycott and organization picketing.

Summing up the session, Russ Nixon, Washington Representative of the Electrical Workers (UE), said there was "utter failure to move ahead on unemployment protections and benefits, no action on social security, no results on long overdue minimum wage and hour legislation." Nor was any action taken on tax reform, "high prices, monopoly profiteering and assaults on small business. . . . Our shocking educational shortages and defects were not dealt with and the vast needs and opportunities for public health advances were ignored." The railroad union weekly, *Labor*, added that "the session turned out to be one of compromise and failure on many bills bearing the liberal label."

Second Session: The 1960 session, with its adjournment for the party nominating conventions in the summer, also accomplished very little for the people. Even *Business Week*, July 9, admitted: "So far this year, Congress has done little to make a legislative record for either party. It's biggest achievement is a civil rights bill designed to secure Negro voting rights. It also adopted a routine extension of corporate income taxes and excises, passed most of the appropriation bills, and jammed through a revision of the Sugar Quota Act just before recessing for the conventions. The Senate ratified the Japanese security treaty," which guarantees U.S. continued use of military bases in Japan.

The much watered-down civil rights bill (referred to elsewhere) was passed in May after a long debate and a Southern filibuster of nine days.

A salary-increase bill was passed over an Eisenhower veto. It gave an increase of 7.5% to a million workers in the classified civil service and 8% to 600,000 postal employees. Labor called it the sharpest legislative setback of the Administration during the session.

Legislation was passed to provide support for farm prices and to penalize payola (deceptive broadcasting practices). Funds were increased to provide milk lunches in the public schools.

An outstanding foreign policy move was ratification of the Antarctic Treaty between the U.S. and eleven nations including the Soviet Union. It prohibits military operations, weapons testing and nuclear testing and it provides for freedom of scientific investigations and inspections, including aerial, over an area of the world as large as the U.S. and Europe combined.

Congress authorized the President to cut the Cuban sugar quota and prohibited increasing it. He immediately cut the 1960 quota by 22%. Later, in the discussion on cutting the Dominican quota, strong sentiment in favor of the Trujillo dictatorship was expressed especially by Democrats. The report on this in the 1961 *World Almanac*, says: "There was opposition in both houses to punishing Trujillo for his 'dictatorship.' Sen. Allen J. Ellender said overthrow of Trujillo would leave a vacuum for communist infiltration. Rep. Harold D. Cooley . . . expressed the same view, and the House leader, Rep. John W. McCormack, rejected the Administration's 'declaration of war' on the Dominican Republic." No agreement was reached on a bill to cut the Dominican quota.

The period after the recess failed to accomplish anything important, enacting only some non-controversial measures. None of the legislation that Kennedy and Johnson had expected to obtain to impress the voters was adopted.

Medical care for the aged through the social security system was defeated in the Senate by 51 to 44, with most Republicans and 19 southern and border-state Democrats voting against it. All that was passed was a bill giving the states \$200 million to help pay medical bills for old people on welfare rolls.

Aid to education was killed when the House Rules Committee refused to permit a conference on the bills which had been passed in different forms in both chambers. So the bills died when Congress adjourned.

A totally inadequate minimum wage bill favored by Eisenhower

had passed the House at the end of June. The Senate, after the recess, passed the Kennedy-sponsored version raising the minimum to \$1.25 an hour. But no compromise could be reached in conference and the Kennedy forces agreed that no bill was better than the House version, which if passed, would have foreclosed any chance for an adequate wage bill for years to come.

As for housing, the omnibus bill passed by the Senate in June was similar to the bill passed later by the House Banking Committee. But the Rules Committee again defeated the measure by refusing to let the House bill get to the floor before the end of the session. So all that passed was an emergency stopgap measure providing for extension of the home improvement loan program and some additional aid to college housing.

The results showed that the GOP-Southern Democrat coalition was in full control of the session. And neither Kennedy nor Nixon during the campaign attacked this reactionary coalition that blocked action on various welfare measures such as minimum wage, school aid, housing and medical care. Both Republicans and Democrats were involved in the failures.

Cold War Influences: The military domination of the whole second session of Congress, both before and after the recess, was noted by the *Washington Newsletter* of the Friends Committee on National Legislation which said in its October, 1960 issue: "There were long debates over relatively modest savings to be obtained by cutting education, housing, welfare programs. But there was almost no objection to the military appropriations which account for some two-thirds of the Federal budget."

The Friends Newsletter concluded that, "Congressional thinking is still dominated primarily by the cold war; military men can get nearly everything they want on Capitol Hill." It illustrated this by stating that, "The Defense Department got almost exactly the \$39.2 billion it asked for the coming year, plus an additional \$1.36 billion for military construction. There were more billions for foreign military aid and atomic energy." And agreements with 7 nations to "transfer nuclear weapons systems to NATO allies were approved with almost no debate and without a vote, despite the valiant efforts of opponents."

Labor-Liberal Appraisal: The AFL-CIO blamed the failure of Congress to enact progressive legislation on the combination of Eisenhower's constant vetoes and threats of vetoes, and also on the misuse

of Congressional rules by the coalition of conservative Republicans and southern Democrats. In its pamphlet, *Labor Looks at the 86th Congress*, an analysis of the two-year record of the House and Senate, it said that, "In no recent Congress have so many highly important legislative measures been killed or crippled."

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, editorialized in its July-October issue of *Rights*: "The 86th Congress showed again the sinister power of the coalition of southern Democrats and reactionary Republicans. In the House, that combination succeeded in passing practically every anti-civil-libertarian bill recommended by a committee. In the Senate, despite persistent efforts of the coalition, the effective work of the liberal Democrats prevented almost all the bad legislation from being passed."

Independent labor unions, as represented by the Longshoremen (West Coast), reviewing both sessions, said they "produced these two major results in two years of labor: Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin (the worst set-back since Taft-Hartley), and a modest civil rights act. It flunked on minimum wage, school construction, modernization of unemployment insurance. . . . And on the big question of medical care for the aged, it came up with nothing more than a charity program." (*Washington Report*, Sept. 12, 1960.)

Americans for Democratic Action in the *ADA World* (Sept., 1960), which supported Kennedy for President, said, "The most predominantly liberal and Democratic Congress since 1936 was barely able to assure the continuance of existing programs, much less respond to new challenges. . . . The public interest was almost consistently subverted by the will of a minority made up of Dixiecrats and 19th Century Republicans."

ELECTION OF KENNEDY

In the November 8, 1960 election the White House was returned to Democratic control after eight years of Republican rule. Sen. John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts was elected President and Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas Vice President.

The Democratic ticket, with just under a half of the popular vote gained its victory by winning huge pluralities in the cities of the major industrial states and in the Mid-Atlantic area. It also held most of the

states in the South and carried three in New England as well as several in the Plain and Mountain areas.

Kennedy at 43, the youngest man ever elected President, won by the smallest margin of the popular vote in this century, although running on a relatively liberal platform. His opponent, Vice President Richard Nixon of California, with a record of reaction and red-baiting running back to pre-McCarthy days, and the Republican candidate for Vice President, Henry Cabot Lodge, although presented as more "mature" in their international experience, were unable quite to overcome the combination of a personally-attractive candidate who ran partly on the record of Franklin D. Roosevelt and who had the almost unanimous support of organized labor.

The final count showed that Kennedy had carried Hawaii by 115 votes reversing the earlier 141 vote margin of Nixon. With Hawaii's 3 electoral votes, Kennedy finally had a total of 303 to Nixon's 219, while 15 went to Sen. Harry Byrd of Virginia. The national popular vote was Kennedy 34,221,349, Nixon 34,108,546, giving Kennedy a plurality of 112,803. There were 607,870 votes for unpledged electors who later voted for Byrd.

NEGROES SUPPORT KENNEDY

A postelection poll by the American Institute of Public Opinion indicated that Negro voters had overwhelmingly supported Kennedy. It made the difference between victory and defeat in several states. This "Gallup Poll" indicated that seven out of ten Negroes voted for the Democratic ticket. This represented an increase of seven percentage points in Democratic strength among Negroes since 1956. However, in 1952 about 8 out of 10 Negroes had voted for Stevenson.

Another Gallup conclusion was that in the nation's largest cities—over 500,000 in population—three out of four Negro voters were in the Democratic column in 1960. In Northern cities where the Negro vote is traditionally Democratic, Kennedy regained the losses to Eisenhower in 1956. New York City's Harlem gave about 78% of its vote to Kennedy.

Economic factors were given as a main reason for the large Negro vote for Kennedy, *New York Times* reporter Anthony Lewis wrote, Nov. 27: "Negroes have been hurt worse by unemployment, and since

New Deal days they have voted for the Democrats as the party favoring the lower income groups."

Also it was agreed that Kennedy during the campaign did more than Nixon to identify himself with the Negro cause. Especially important was Kennedy's telephone call of sympathy to the wife of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. when the Southern integration leader was jailed on a framed-up traffic charge. Nixon made no comment on this episode. Kennedy also spoke out early in support of the sit-in movement, and he was responsible for the strongest civil rights plank ever included in a Democratic platform. He had also voted in Congress for several FEPC bills opposed by Nixon.

THE REPUBLICAN PRESS

The majority of the press were for the Republican candidates. *"Editor and Publisher"* reported that of 939 daily newspapers, 731 editorially supported Nixon.

Papers with a total circulation of 8,448,000 were for Kennedy; those representing a total circulation of 38,600,203 supported Nixon. Those listing themselves as "independent" had a circulation of 7,135,000. Of the six daily papers in Boston, Kennedy's home city, not one supported him. Other cities where no paper supported Kennedy included Baltimore, Birmingham, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Dallas, Denver, Des Moines, Detroit, Houston, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, Memphis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Omaha, Philadelphia, Phoenix, St. Paul, San Francisco, Seattle, Tucson and Tulsa.

STATE GOVERNORS

In the 1960 election 27 governorships of states were at stake and 15 of them were won by Democrats and 12 by Republicans leaving the Democrats with one more than they had before. The line-up following the election was 34 Democratic governors and 16 Republican.

The Democrats captured former Republican seats in Indiana, Nebraska, Illinois, Delaware, North Dakota, Rhode Island and West Virginia. On the other hand Republicans unseated Democratic governors

in Kansas, Massachusetts, Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota and New Mexico.

In Indiana, where the state "right-to-work" law was a hot issue, the Democratic victor, who stood strongly for repeal of this anti-labor legislation, was elected even though Nixon carried the state with the help of a heavy anti-Catholic vote.

Louis Munoz Marin was decisively re-elected governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico despite an outspoken campaign by the island's three Catholic bishops against his Popular Democratic Party.

CHANGES IN CONGRESS

Although they had made considerable gains in Congress in the 1958 elections, the Democrats, while winning the Presidency, lost strength in the lower house in 1960. The Republicans made corresponding gains over their position in the previous Congress.

When the new Congress convened in January 1961 (34 Senate seats had been contested in the 1960 election) there were 65 Democrats compared with 66 in the last Congress while the number of Republican Senators rose from 34 to 35. On the House side, where all seats were contested in 1960, the number of Democrats declined from 283 in the last Congress to 261 in the new one, while the number of Republicans rose from 154 to 173.

The losses of House seats by Democrats were mostly by liberals in urban areas. The Southern reactionary Democrats from rural one-party areas maintained their strength and thereby buttressed the GOP-Dixiecrat coalition.

Progressive Defeated by Smears: Some of the most progressive congressmen lost out. For example William H. Meyer of Vermont, Leonard G. Wolf of Iowa, Byron L. Johnson of Colorado, George A. Kasem of California all had spoken out for peace and co-existence with the Soviet world. Also Roy Wier of Minnesota, who was the only lawmaker who had consistently voted against the House Un-American Committee.

Charles O. Porter of Oregon was the victim of a smear campaign based on his early support of Castro in Cuba, his advocacy of trade with China and his association with disarmament conferences abroad supported by Cyrus Eaton, the millionaire backer of anti-cold war policies.

In an article in *The Nation* (Dec. 3, 1960) Porter described how

these points were used by the newspapers in his district. Seven out of nine dailies and 22 out of 26 weeklies were "after my political scalp and didn't care how they got it." In the last two weeks of the campaign they generally ignored Porter's news releases. He concluded that, "My positive and active role in foreign affairs made me vulnerable for the kind of campaign that was waged against me."

The same sort of McCarthy-style red-baiting did not succeed, however, against Democrat Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin, who won despite the Nixon trend in that state and attempts to equate his vote against conscription and his leadership in behalf of a National Peace Agency with "appeasement" and "softness on Communism."

Lawyers, Businessmen, Women, Negroes: Lawyers again predominated in the 87th Congress. In fact 63% of the Senators had been engaged in that profession while 31% were described as having backgrounds in business or banking. In the House the survey showed that 56% were lawyers and that 31% had been in business or banking.

All of these percentages were a little higher than those shown for the previous Congress, when lawyers made up 62% of the Senators and 52% of the Representatives, and business or banking was the background of 29% of the members in both chambers.

Some had more than one profession, the other major classifications being agriculture, journalism, medicine, engineering and teaching. Altogether, "that ought to make a pretty conservative Congress," wrote the Washington correspondent of the conservative *Commercial & Financial Chronicle* Nov. 24, 1960. "Let's hope they stick to their professions and backgrounds."

Two women were elected as Senators in the 87th Congress, Mrs. Maurine Neuberger (D., Ore.) having won the seat occupied by her husband, the late Richard L. Neuberger, a leading liberal who died in March, 1960. Her Republican opposite number is Margaret C. Smith of Maine who had been the sole woman in the Senate since 1949.

In the House the new Congress has 15 women Representatives, 9 Democrats and 6 Republicans, compared with 8 of each in the previous Congress.

There are still only 4 Negroes in the House—Adam C. Powell of N. Y. City, William L. Dawson of Chicago, Charles C. Diggs Jr. of Detroit, and Robert N. C. Nix of Philadelphia. There are none in the Senate. In proportion to population the Negro people should have at least ten times this number of representatives in Congress.

UNION POLITICAL ACTIVITY

The AFL-CIO executive council endorsed the Democratic ticket and through its Committee on Political Education (COPE) conducted an effective campaign to get union members to register and vote. Union support for the Democratic candidates was stronger than in 1956 and most of the top leaders came out officially for Kennedy. Only Pres. Minton of a small union, the Glassblowers Assn., personally endorsed Nixon. Pres. A. Philip Randolph of the Sleeping Car Porters dissented in the executive council endorsement of Kennedy.

United Electrical Workers (UE), at its 25th convention in September, declared that although the Nixon-Lodge-Republican record was a "straight anti-union, pro-boss line," Kennedy also had used his public position "to oppose unions that were not lined up with the AFL-CIO bureaucratic set-up." It charged him with supporting campaigns of division and disruption among electrical workers, and quoted his campaign statement in September that, "An effective Attorney General under present federal law could remove James Hoffa as head of the Teamsters Union and depose Harry Bridges as boss of the Longshoremén."

The UE charged also that Kennedy, although challenged by Mrs. Roosevelt, had refused to issue a clear repudiation of McCarthyism. "Instead, he has indicated that he supports all the repressive legislation on the books" and, throughout his entire Congressional career, "has supported the House Un-American Committee and the Senate Internal Security (Eastland) Committee. In the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin bill, he supported the provision which excludes 'communists' from union employment in any way."

Another independent union, the Longshoremén (West Coast) also refused to endorse either candidate, its executive board finding both "lacking in any desire for a program for bringing an end to the cold war which drains our resources and keeps us under the threat of nuclear war."

The independent Teamsters, largest union in the U.S., also made no endorsement although it centered its fire on Kennedy who had said he was not satisfied to see a man like Teamster President James R. Hoffa "still free." It also concentrated its attacks on congressmen who had voted for the Landrum-Griffin law.

Cope Conclusions: In a post-election appraisal, AFL-CIO's COPE, in its *Political Memo* (Nov. 21) contended that Kennedy "won a great victory—and on a liberal platform." Among the reasons it was "great" was: he had to fight the tradition that no Roman Catholic could be elected President of the United States; he "had to overcome the enormous popularity of President Eisenhower whose prestige Nixon clutched like a man holding on to an oak tree in a hurricane," and he had to battle the "peace and prosperity" theme which "entranced many millions of people."

As proof of the work it had done for Kennedy COPE cited the fact that he had won 65% of the big city vote compared with only 52% that went to Stevenson in 1956. Also it noted that in the nation's 14 largest suburbs Kennedy received 49% of the vote to Stevenson's 32%. On the other hand, in the South where there is a smaller proportion of union members among the workers Kennedy ran 2.5% behind the 1956 Democratic candidate.

State branches of COPE supported 24 candidates for the U.S. Senate of which 15 were elected. Five of the remaining 9 ran in traditionally conservative areas and had little or no chance of winning. Fourteen of the state gubernatorial candidates out of a list of 23 backed by COPE were elected. In some 258 congressional districts COPE-supported candidates for the House were elected in 153.

Railroaders and Miners: The organ of the railroad unions, *Labor*, said the big-city families voted for Kennedy because he called for an all-out "program of full-employment, economic gains and social justice." Later, answering the daily newspaper warning to Kennedy that on account of the closeness of the popular vote he should "go slow" on his program, it urged that he pay no attention to the capitalist press. "Newspapers are part and parcel of Big Business which has always opposed progressive measures for the benefit of the mass of people."

Railway Labor's Political League reported that the great majority of Senate and House candidates in both parties which it had endorsed "triumphed in their races." Labor's Non-Partisan League, political arm of the United Mine Workers, in its post-election statement by Director Robert E. Howe, said that, "The Kennedy emphasis on bread and butter issues, his generalities on economic growth and his specifics such as federal aid to depressed areas . . . were crucial in such areas as Pennsylvania's steel and mining communities and other depressed communities." Out of 63 candidates for the U.S. Senate and House

(54 Democrats and 9 Republicans) endorsed by the United Mine Workers, 53 were elected.

MINORITY PARTIES AND CANDIDATES

Candidates of minority parties and tickets, several of them very reactionary, received over 386,000 votes in 1960, or about 30,000 less than four years before. The total vote cast for other than the two major candidates in 1960 was over 502,000. This included, however, over 116,000 ballots for 8 unpledged electors of the Democratic Party in Mississippi.

Among the minority groups and tickets were the National States Rights Party (with Gov. Faubus of Arkansas as Presidential candidate) which polled nearly 170,000 votes in Louisiana while the same ticket polled nearly 45,000 votes in four other states.

There were also a few votes (about 46,000) for the Prohibition Party candidate in 11 states; for a Constitution Party in Texas (over 18,000); for a Conservative Party in New Jersey (8,700), and one with the same name in Virginia (4,200); as well as a few thousand votes combined for the Tax Cut ticket, the Afro-American candidate in Alabama, the Independent American Party in Michigan, and the Constitution Party in Washington State, along with some scattered write-in votes in other states.

Parties with socialist or labor-oriented programs, mentioned in earlier Labor Fact Books, are worth separate mention, although some ran no candidates in 1960:

Liberal Party of New York State: This party claimed that it provided the votes that carried New York State for Kennedy. The Liberal vote for him totaled 406,167 and he won the state by a margin of 383,666. While generally endorsing Democrats the Liberal Party also backed two Republican judges, one of whom needed the Liberal vote to win.

In a preamble to a legislative program for N.Y. State, issued in January, 1961, the party declared that the trend in the nation was running "strongly in the direction of liberalism," and the election in 1960 indicated "welcome signs of change in the political and social climate in the country." The program contained the party's advanced

views on labor, civil rights and liberties, full employment, education, public health, consumer protection, problems of the aging, natural resources, housing, rent control, juvenile delinquency, taxation and other problems.

Socialist Labor Party: In 1960 the SLP, which has contested every election since 1892, got on the ballot in 16 states, two more than in 1956, and received a total of 48,031 counted votes for its presidential candidates, Eric Haas, editor of its official organ, the *Weekly People*. Its vice presidential candidate was Georgia Cozzini, a Milwaukee housewife.

In a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times* (Oct. 27) the party reported that it had been forced off the ballot in New York State "on a technical objection raised by the Democratic Party solely to serve its sordid machine politics." It urged its readers to write in the name of Haas and thus "give your support to the movement that seeks to rid humanity of dangerously outworn capitalism and all forms of political oppression, including Soviet bureaucratic despotism." It charged also that this year "the major party politicians (who pose as champions of democracy!) have extended the conspiracy of silence by depriving the national candidates of the Socialist Labor Party of their democratic right to 'equal time' on the radio and TV channels . . . which are the public property of the American people. And in state after state the election laws are being rewritten or reinterpreted to keep the SLP off the ballot, thereby abridging your right to hear all sides and to choose freely between all existing parties."

Socialist Workers Party: The Socialist Workers Party nominated for President its national secretary, Farrell Dobbs and for Vice President Myra Tanner Weiss. It was on the ballot in 12 states and obtained a total of 40,174 counted votes.

Its election platform stated that "The majority of the human race have turned toward the Soviet Union and China as representing the road of progress." And it mentioned the fact that "our military experts have repeatedly admitted that the Soviet Union does not need war, does not want war, and is not planning an attack."

Although asserting, as this Trotskyite party has done in the past, that the Soviet Union and the countries allied with it "stand for totalitarianism," and "suffer from bureaucratic police regimes that stifle freedom of thought and expression," it took the position that

the U.S. "has neither the right nor the duty to meddle in the internal affairs of other countries." So it urged Congress and the White House to "pledge the world that America will never resort to war under any circumstances. As proof of our desire for peace, let us withdraw all troops from foreign soil, give up all foreign military bases, put a permanent halt to nuclear-weapons tests, and dismantle the stockpile of A-bombs and H-bombs."

Under other slogans such as "against capitalist militarism, and economic insecurity, restore and expand democratic rights, for adequate government to the farmers, for an emergency government program of housing and public works, repeal taxes on low incomes, for government ownership of industry, and for independent political action," it covered many demands made by socialist and progressive parties in previous campaigns.

The SWP ticket received the largest vote this party had counted since it first ran a candidate for President in 1948 when it received 13,613 votes in eleven states. Of its 1960 presidential votes, 14,319, were counted in New York State and 11,402 in New Jersey.

Socialist Party—Social Democratic Federation: For the first time in this century the Socialist Party, now known as the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation, in 1960 did not run a candidate for President. It stated that it was unable to cope with the backbreaking campaign of circulating petitions to get on the ballot. And in its organ, *New America*, it stated editorially (Sept. 5) that "the liberal and labor forces are not interested in a protest movement," but "in working for their goals within the Democratic Party."

Its third and most fundamental reason was that in the next period "American socialism must concentrate its efforts on the battle for political realignment, or the creation of a real second party that will unite labor, liberals and Negroes, and provide them with an instrument for principled debate and effective action."

The program adopted at the party convention, attended by some 200 delegates, stated in its introduction: "We propose a society in which democratic participation in economic and political life will set us free to attack and conquer war, racial antagonism, hunger, disease, poverty and oppression." For the world struggle against poverty the party heartily supported "the suggestion of the Socialist International, to which it belongs, that each nation pay at least 1% of its national income into a general fund out of which grants be made according to need. So

long as any such aid must be given on a bilateral basis [that is from the U.S. government to, say, South Korea] the Socialist Party insists that it be genuinely economic, not military."

Its resolution on Latin America said, "The Socialist Party salutes the Cuban people and expresses its full support of the revolutionary overthrow of the criminal Batista regime. We are in full sympathy with the objectives of the Cuban revolution, and are emphatically opposed to any attempt on the part of the U.S. government to intervene either directly or indirectly against the Castro regime."

Communist Party of the U. S.: No presidential candidates were nominated by the Communist Party in the 1960 election. It urged its members to get out and register votes, explain the issues, warn against illusions and strengthen the development of all forces making for a new broad peoples party movement in the future.

A resolution on the 1960 elections was adopted by the National Exective Committee of the Party in early August, after the two old parties had held their nominating conventions. It noted the fact that while "deeply entrenched political machines, subservient to monopoly capitalism, dominated these conventions and nominated candidates traditionally associated with reactionary foreign and domestic policies . . . the platform concessions they were forced to make will haunt them throughout their administrations, and can be made to stimulate a mass movement of tremendous proportions for their fulfillment."

Under the circumstances of the 1960 campaign, with both old-party tickets "basing themselves on cold-war positions of 'military strength' or more billions for armaments and anti-Communism, and in the face of a widespread mass dissatisfaction with their past reactionary records," it would be wrong, it said, to consider any one candidate a "lesser evil." However, it opposed any negative or defeatist attitude and said the idea of boycotting the election "reflects only petty-bourgeois frustration." And it attacked the SWP (Trotskyites) as a sect rendering "only lip service to socialist aims," but who "by their policies, isolate themselves from the people, and sow discord and disunity."

On the other hand, the CP recognized that the mass of working class and Negro voters would be found in the ranks of the Democratic Party, and "they are there because they have been influenced to believe in the platform commitments of the Democrats." So it urged its members to work with these voters with a view to developing sentiment

for a future independent party that will represent the broadest interests of the people.

The national election platform of the CP as released in *The Worker* (Oct. 16) stated that "both old parties are committed to policies of anti-communism and cold war." But this did not mean that war is inevitable. On the contrary, "War can be prevented, but not by relying on the Republican or Democratic politicians, on Nixon or Kennedy."

It pointed out that both old parties "are controlled by the most wealthy and powerful monopoly-capitalist groups in the U.S.—by the Rockefellers, Harrimans, DuPonts," who "pull the political strings."

"Peace," it said, "will not be guaranteed by the political representatives of the monopoly-capitalists," whose "policies of grab, rule and rob lead to aggression, more and more armaments, and then war!"

The immediate program of the Party called on the people to struggle for a world at peace and an end to the cold war, and to insist on ending all interference by the U.S. government in the affairs of other nations. It called for admittance of the People's Republic of China to the U.N., its recognition by the U.S., the withdrawal of the Seventh Fleet from Chinese waters, and the repudiation of Chiang Kai-shek.

It demanded discontinuance of all pressure on Cuba and the restoration of full sugar quotas that had been ended by the U.S. It also favored strengthening the UN as an instrument of peace.

The domestic part of the platform of the CP was devoted to detailed proposals in relation to civil rights and the Negro people, enforcement of the Bill of Rights, a program for youth, and progressive taxation.

It concluded that the CP, "though devoted to the socialist reorganization of society, will give all-out support to every struggle of the people" to win the detailed immediate demands it outlines. And it called for the ultimate formation of a "broad, grass-roots Farmer-Labor movement."

People's Rights Party: An attempt to get on the ballot in New York City was made by Arnold Johnson and Mildred McAdory Edelman, both members of the National Committee of the Communist Party. Their independent nominating petitions were filed in the name of the People's Rights Party.

Mrs. Edelman, a woman Negro leader, filed with 3,362 signatures of registered voters as a candidate for state assembly in the 13th A.D. Although only 1,500 signatures were required she was disqualified by the Tammany machine-controlled Board of Elections.

The same thing happened to Johnson who filed 4,326 signatures of registered voters as a candidate for Congress in the 21st Congressional District, although only 3,000 names are required for nomination.

The rulings of the Board of Elections deprived voters of their constitutional rights to nominate independents of their own choice. The attack on the petitions was led by an incumbent Tammany Assemblyman whom the Citizens Union failed to classify as "qualified" for his office.

VOTES AND VOTING RESTRICTIONS

The Census Bureau estimated that there were about 107 million civilians old enough to vote in the 1960 elections. Of this number about 68.8 million, or about 64%, cast their votes for presidential electors, compared with slightly more than 60% in 1956 and 63% in 1952. The presidential vote in 1960 was equal to about 82% of the estimated number of those registered to vote.

Voting age is 21 in all states except Georgia and Kentucky where it is 18, Alaska where it is 19, and Hawaii where it is 20.

American Heritage Foundation estimates that the present election laws which vary from state to state, prevented over 19 million Americans from voting in 1960, including about 8 million who moved during the year.

Five states—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas and Virginia—make the poll tax a prerequisite for voting. Poll tax laws, originally enacted to keep the vote in the hands of the propertied class, are now used in combination with other laws and illegal forces to deprive Negroes of the vote. Nineteen states require proof of literacy. In Mississippi, the literacy test requires that voters "read, write and interpret reasonably any section of the state constitution."

Archaic residency laws, which require as much as 2 years residence in a state and as much as a year in the county or city, also act as a barrier to voting for the 20% of all Americans who move each year.

The failure of many states to provide for absentee ballots also cuts down on the actual vote. Millions of hospitalized and physically disabled persons as well as travelers and migratory workers are prevented from voting by these restrictions. And members of the armed forces also can vote only with difficulty. Various states also deny the vote to paupers, vagrants and persons in poor houses and prisons.

Important points in the program of the Heritage Foundation for

increasing the number of persons who vote include such reforms as: six months state residence for local elections; a 40 to 60 day's residence requirement for voting for President; "more intelligent" absentee voting laws; objective literacy tests that are not rigged and that can be corrected by an "answer-key" provided by educators; and a vote for citizens of the District of Columbia. (This was finally effected by constitutional amendment in 1961.)

Lost, Strayed or Stolen: Because of the closeness of the vote in 1960, charges were made, especially by the Republicans, that irregularities and fraud prevailed in many election districts.

Evidence showed that there were districts where more votes were cast than people living there; many citizens who went to the polls found their registrations carefully "lost." Votes were cast in the names of dead persons; ballots were marked in the names of nonvoting residents or former residents; ballots were spoiled by tearing or defacing during the vote count; even voting machines were jammed, or rigged by setting them to show a big vote for certain candidates before the polls opened; and dozens of other tricks and devices were used to rob the voters of their vote.

The Honest Ballot Assn., a nonpartisan agency, estimated that about 1.5 million persons had their votes stolen and that an equal number, confused by the often-complicated ballots, had their votes thrown out or miscounted.

Quite apart from reforms in the jungle of state election laws, it is contended that a uniform federal law on voting would help to provide the same voting rights and protections to every citizen of the U.S. in electing federal officers. And it should provide better enforcement of election laws in order to reduce voting irregularities, false count and fraud.

UNEQUAL REPRESENTATION

Further evidence on the unequal representation of the people in Congress and in the state legislatures has come to light since our note on this subject in *Labor Fact Book* 13. For example, Rep. Clyde Doyle (D., Calif.) put in the *Congressional Record* (February 4, 1960) new census figures showing the wide range in the number of people represented by each member of the House of Representatives.

One congressional district he cited had a population of 806,000,

another one had only 159,000. Yet each had one congressman. The people in the smallest district on the list thus had five times as much representation as those living in the most populous district.

In state legislatures the apportionment of members is even more unrepresentative. In California 14,014 residents of 3 rural counties had one senator to represent them in the state senate, and 4.1 million people living in Los Angeles County also had one state senator. In the Maryland state senate one senator represents 15,317 persons; one from Baltimore represents 490,201. And in New Jersey about 15% of the voters choose a majority of the state senate. The situation is similar in many other states.

Because of the population trend to the cities and suburbs and because in many states there has been for decades no redistricting according to population, the rural areas get more and more power in the state legislatures. As Anthony Lewis writes in an article on gerrymandering (*N.Y. Times Magazine*, Feb. 19, 1961), "In every large state, rural legislators routinely discriminate against city taxpayers in the allocation of funds for schools, roads and the like, and at the same time resist such urban-desired programs as subsidized housing and unemployment insurance."

CAMPAIGN COSTS AND EXPENDITURES

Political spending in the 1960 campaign apparently reached an all-time high. Preliminary reports indicated that the Republicans had spent much more than the Democrats but somewhat less than the two-to-one ratio of the previous campaigns. By January 26, 1961, Sen. Edward V. Long (D., Mo.) cited estimates of over \$175 million spent at all levels by both parties in the 1960 campaign.

A month before the election the *New York Times*, (Oct. 2) in a special report from Washington said: "Just how much the two parties will collect and spend in the national, state and local elections must of necessity be only a guess because complete reporting of campaign spending is not required by the laws, and politicians have well recognized and approved ways of circumventing the legal restrictions that do exist. It seems certain, however, that the cost of the 1960 campaign will well exceed \$100 million and probably will approach \$200 million."

These figures were probably based on the estimated expenditures

in earlier campaigns, the total for 1956 having been put at around \$155 million. The most detailed material on this subject is given in *The Costs of Democracy* by Prof. Alexander Heard, dean of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina. His study, published in 1960, was based mainly on the 1952 elections.

Big Givers and Corporations: The main contributions come from the big contributors, although both parties publicly try to broaden the base of small contributors. Another story in the *N. Y. Times*, October 2, by Charles Grutzner said that both the New York State finance committees "are training their heaviest efforts on contributors who are good for \$100 to \$5,000."

He added "The term 'big giver' is, of course, relative. The Democratic state campaign may not get as many \$5,000 gifts as the Republicans, but about 70% of its money comes in contributions of more than \$250." And *Business Week*, August 20, 1960, noted that "this year as in the past the bulk of the Presidential campaign cost will be borne by the regulars—steady contributors who are always good for \$100, \$1,000, or \$5,000."

Campaigns for federal offices are costly. "You can't run for the U.S. Senate today in most states without being a wealthy man or finding the 'fat cats' or pressure groups to finance the campaign," said Pres. George Romney of the American Motors Corp. (*N. Y. Times*, July 1, 1960.)

In commenting on the encouragement given by the tax law to widespread political giving, *Wall Street Journal*, August 31, 1960, noted that "Well-heeled contributors often take advantage of the law to provide funds to numerous committees of the same party located in various states and localities." One can make a gift of \$3,000 annually to an unlimited number of persons without having to pay a gift tax. A married man reporting his taxes jointly with his wife can give double this amount to any number of donees.

Although corporations are prohibited by law from making direct contributions they can do it through individuals, often through \$100-a-plate dinners held by party political committees. "If six executives of a company show up at a political dinner," wrote reporter Grutzner in another *New York Times* article, October 20, "each with three guests, and turn in expense accounts for 'business entertainment,' \$2,400 is transferred from the corporation to a political party by a single dinner." Or the corporation may merely raise the salaries of certain

executives to a figure "which, by oral agreement, will take care of extensive entertaining, including a certain number of \$100 dinners of both political parties." And the corporation can charge all this extra "salary" up to expenses before taxes thus creating "a favorable climate among politicians of both parties with very little real cost to it."

NO CURB ON FILIBUSTER

Another effort was made by the liberals in the 87th Congress to curb the unlimited debate or filibuster power in the Senate by establishing majority rule. At present under Rule 22 of the Senate it takes a two-thirds vote of all members voting, or usually 67 votes, to close debate and vote. The liberals were trying to cut this down to three-fifths of the Senators present, or to 60. But a motion to shelve action on this matter was carried January 11, 1961 by a vote of 50 to 46.

This leaves a Senate minority with the power to prevent passage of civil rights and other measures by talking them to death. For under the present rule no filibuster has been broken by cloture vote since 1927 and the filibuster has been used 9 times since then to kill civil rights legislation.

The fact that Kennedy and Vice President Johnson made no effort to influence the votes of several Senators who could easily have been won over for the filibuster curb was considered a betrayal of the Democratic platform of 1960. It had promised action "at the beginning of the 87th Congress to improve Congressional procedures so that majority rule prevails." And some liberal Republicans like Senator Clifford Case of New Jersey contended the Congressional failure to change Rule 22 was a violation also of the Republican platform.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE CHANGES IN 1961

The Rules Committee of the House, long dominated by Chairman Smith, had been a major block in the way of progressive legislation in Congress. By sometimes refusing to let bills come before the House for a vote and by other practices it had served the most conservative employer and business interests.

In the 87th Congress in January 1961 the powers of this committee were not diminished. But by a close vote, 217 to 212, the Administration forces assisted by 22 Republicans were able to have the committee

enlarged by three members, from 12 to 15. The following appointments of two Democrats then gave the liberals 8 votes to open the way for action on bills that previously would have been bottled up by Smith. This was regarded as a victory for President Kennedy who intervened to round up votes for the change. It still left Smith able to exert certain powers of sabotaging the work of the committee but with House Speaker Sam Rayburn in a position to determine what legislation reaches the floor.

Although this change was achieved in the Rules Committee the assignment of committee posts in the 78th Congress did little or nothing to liberalize other key committees. The Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Finance Committee were still in the hands of southern conservatives, the first controlled by a chairman and a majority opposed to civil rights, the second by those opposed to tax reform and the closing of tax loopholes. In fact, about two-thirds of the committees were still headed by Southern conservatives.

In the House also the key committee, especially Ways and Means, remained dominated by reactionaries. However, one change for the better was the succession of Adam Clayton Powell (D., N.Y.) to the chairmanship of the House Education and Labor Committee. This post had previously been held by Graham A. Barden, a reactionary North Carolina Democrat, who decided not to run for Congress in 1960.

VII. CANADIAN LABOR DEVELOPMENTS

ECONOMIC TRENDS

Somewhat similarly to the United States the gross national product in Canada was reported slightly higher in 1960 than in 1959. Actually, however, gross national product per person, adjusted for price changes, has never regained the 1956 level. In 1960 it was about 4% under 1956. In other words, real growth in the Canadian economy stopped over four years ago. Since then the underlying weaknesses have become more painfully evident.

Expressed in human terms, the trouble is seen as an increasing part of the labor force chronically unemployed. The labor force since 1956 has been growing substantially faster than employment.

Government statistics showed the unemployed percentage of total employees (*not* labor force) to be 4.7% at the summer low point in 1959; 5.9% in 1960; 11.6% at the winter peak in 1959-60; 7.8% in December 1959 and 9.9% in December 1960. The 1960-61 winter peak remains to be seen at the time of writing.

The general trend of employment was upward in 1959 and downward in 1960. This, of course, masked diverse trends in the main sectors. Manufacturing employment see-sawed up a little in 1959 but fell off steadily in 1960. The same was generally true in mining. Construction employment rose more in 1959 and fell further in 1960. Employment in trade and services continued steadily upward. Since the latter fields are where most women work, unemployment has been less severe among them.

Goods production generally rose faster than employment in 1959 and declined less in 1960—indicating a steady increase in productivity. Mining output started down after September 1959. World over-production of the important base metals and U.S. government decision not to renew uranium contracts in Canada were the principal factors. Trade and service activity continued to increase, although retail sales appeared to be tapering off at the close of 1960. Department and chain

stores continued to improve their position at the expense of independents. Consumer prices continued edging upward, with an overall increase of 2.7% during the two years.

By the close of 1960, total consumer expenditures (normally two-thirds of gross national expenditure) were levelling off. Labor income, the major element in total consumer effective demand, rose steadily in 1959, moved sidewise in early 1960, turned up and then levelled off again towards the end of the year. Purchases of durable goods helped hold the economy up in 1959, and the reverse in 1960.

In the whole sector of non-government capital expenditures, these trends were not apparent: housing down a little in 1959, down much more in 1960; non-residential construction about level in 1959, down somewhat in 1960; machinery and equipment expenditures up in 1959, down substantially in 1960; the rapid build-up of inventories in 1959 was reversed in 1960. Government expenditures in total continued to expand, but not rapidly.

Farm cash income changed very little in 1959 and 1960—down about 2.5% from the 1952 high.

Exports (value) increased about 5% in 1959, and another 5% in 1960. Imports (value) increased 9% in 1959, and decreased slightly in 1960. There was a notable shift in trade as the year 1960 progressed, mainly reflected in decreasing exports to the United States. Just after the end of the year, a new trade deal with China was announced covering exports of \$60 million worth of wheat and barley. This indication of increased trade with China was welcomed by many labor unionists who have been demanding that such trade be freed of restrictions imposed at the behest of Washington.

LABOR AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS

Consumer expenditures per person (or per family), after adjustment for price changes, following declines in 1957 and 1958, rose a little in 1959 but fell off again in 1960. Weekly earnings (wages and salaries) of those employed in all industries (including trade and services) averaged \$70.43 in 1958, \$73.47 in 1959 and \$75.80 in 1960. The 3.2% increase in 1960 was just about sufficient to offset the effect of increased unemployment on aggregate labor income, but the averages obscure the distinctly disturbing trend apparent in the latter part of the year.

There is nothing comparable in Canada to the U.S. Labor Department's "City Workers' Family Budget" or the Heller Committee wage-earner's family budget. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics surveyed city family expenditure patterns in 1957, using a sample covering an income range of \$2,500 to \$7,000 a year. The average then was \$4,830. Adjusted for the price rise since then, this family "budget" would have cost \$5,130 at the end of 1960. But 52 weeks of the average industrial wage and salary figure noted above for 1960 comes to only \$3,942—far short of the budget level. No wonder so many families have found they cannot exist without more than one bread-winner.

The 40-hour week is general in Canadian industry. The averages for 1959 and 1960 in mining were 41.5 and 41.5 hours; in manufacturing 40.7 and 40.2 hours; in construction 40.2 and 40.6 hours. In manufacturing, hours worked in 1960 were rather consistently under 1959; in mining and construction the pattern was less regular. The steadily rising unemployment level has indicated the necessity of a shorter work-week to spread work, but only a few progressive unions have begun any kind of campaign on this issue. The pressure to maintain and expand family incomes has so far made impossible any united movement to limit overtime, although the demand has been voiced within several unions.

The Unemployment Insurance Fund, which had reached a peak of \$927 million at the end of 1956, was reduced to one-third of this by the end of 1960. The excess of outgo over income in recent years has been used as the basis for attack by employers claiming that seasonal coverage is too liberal, that claimants defraud the fund, and that certain groups ought not to be counted as unemployed because they are married women who do not need to support their families or others for whom part-time work is considered most suitable.

Because of the relatively greater expansion of office work and service industries in recent years, the proportion of women in the total labor force has been rising—24.7% at the beginning of 1959, 26.7% at the end of 1960. Measured in a different way, the participation rate of women in the labor force (percentage of female population over 14 years in the labor force) has risen from 26.4% to 28.8% in this period. For the same reason the unemployment rate among women workers has been considerably less than among the men. Equal pay laws to prevent discrimination against women workers have been enacted in seven provinces and by the Dominion government since World War II. All these laws are only of limited applicability—and Quebec, one of the

big industrial provinces, has no such legislation. The woman herself must register the complaint and there are many loopholes. A study of trade union agreements by the Department of Labor showed equal pay provisions in only 10% of them.

The problems of young workers in getting jobs have been increasing year after year. Many now are unable to get into the working force at all. Those who do, face much higher unemployment probabilities than the older workers. In December 1960, 13.6% of the age group 14-19 years in *the labor force*, were officially unemployed.

Workers at the other end of the age scale have also been hard hit. Anyone over 40 who loses a job, finds it very difficult to obtain employment again. Discrimination in hiring faces older workers for several reasons—among others that hiring them would increase pension liabilities. In part to overcome this discrimination, unions have been pressing for much earlier vesting of pension rights (not usual now short of twenty years). The Ontario provincial government has been studying this question since the federal government backed out of any attempt to regulate pension vesting requirements.

Accidents continue to take serious toll of workers' lives. The official reports of industrial facilities show 1,106 killed in 1959, and 445 in the first six months of 1960 when employment was lower. As a result of a completely inexcusable cave-in on a construction job where five workers were killed in Toronto, a Royal Commission was appointed to receive representations from trade unions and other interested parties looking towards improved safety legislation and enforcement. During the past two years, Workmen's Compensation Acts in Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Nova Scotia have been improved somewhat in their provision for death benefits and survivors' pensions.

Hospital insurance is now (or will shortly be) provided by all provincial governments. Mostly this is on a fee basis, but in some instances the cost is to be met from general taxation. It has become general in union bargaining to require more and more employers to pay whatever charges are made for this service. Now there is growing pressure for provincial health schemes to be expanded to include medical service, but so far only Saskatchewan is moving into this field.

CANADIAN TRADE UNIONS

Total trade union membership remained practically stationary in

1959 and 1960 at just under 1.5 million. This figure was approximately 32% of the total of nonagricultural employees in the labor force. By central organization affiliation union membership in 1960 was divided as follows: 77% in Canadian Labor Congress (mostly unions affiliated also with AFL-CIO in the U.S. but some with CLC only), 14% in unaffiliated international, national, regional and local organizations, 7% in the Confederation of National Trade Unions (formerly the Canadian and Catholic Confederation of Labor), and 2% in AFL-CIO unions with no Canadian affiliation. During the period under discussion the CLC lost and the NTU gained some members.

Two-thirds of the total organized workers of Canada are distributed in 108 international unions. The ten largest unions embracing one-third of all trade unionists are, in descending order of size—Steelworkers, Carpenters, Auto Workers, Public Employees, Railway Transport & General Workers, Machinists, Teamsters, Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, International Woodworkers, and the Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers.

There have been a number of changes in union affiliation in the past two years. The Woodworkers were forcibly deprived of two locals by the Newfoundland government which compelled the formation of the Newfoundland Brotherhood of Wood Workers, "independent." The CLC added to the list of expelled unions the Seafarers International Union, the Operating Engineers, and the Teamsters. The National Unemployment Commission Association and three provincial civil service organizations in Alberta, British Columbia and Newfoundland withdrew voluntarily from the CLC.

The relative stagnation in overall organization of Canadian workers is only in part attributable to the decline in economic activity. Objectively more significant has been the relative decline in production worker employment and expansion of the hard-to-organize technical, clerical and service industry staffs in recent years. Another contributing factor has been the bankrupt policy of right wing trade union leaders who have substituted raiding for organizing.

As the economic cycle has turned down again the employer offensive has mounted. A concerted attack has been made on labor under the slick argument that high wages are pricing Canadian products out of both domestic and foreign markets. Some of the trade unions are doing a good job in showing that export policies are laid down for many Canadian plants in their U.S. parent company offices, and that the

big inroads on the Canadian home market have been made by U.S. products, not those from "low wage" countries. Now there is almost continuous employer and government demand to "hold the line" on wages. On the whole, however, the labor counter-campaign, to show up the real causes of the present difficulties and win public support for policies to maintain purchasing power and lighten the burdens of the depression, has not been impressive.

An event which broke new ground for the trade union movement in Canada was the visit of a Chinese union delegation to the spring conference of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers (UE) in 1959. The delegation was warmly received by the workers in a number of big electrical plants where the managements had arranged inspection visits for the Chinese unionists. A return visit by a Canadian delegation to China took place in the autumn of 1960. The Quebec Federation of Labor also went on record in favor of exchanging trade union delegations with China and the Soviet Union. The British Columbia Federation of Labor (CLC) decided to send a trade union delegation to visit Cuba but was over-ruled by the national CLC headquarters. Other unions in British Columbia are reported to be considering such a visit.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING DIFFICULTIES

Collective bargaining has been getting more and more difficult for the trade unions in recent months and the number of strikes has been increasing. But the aggregate man-days involved were less in 1959 than in 1958, and a further reduction took place in 1960. Among important strikes in 1959 was that of the Woodworkers in British Columbia (2½ months) resulting in a 20-cent increase over a two-year contract; the Carpenters in Hamilton (3 months) which won a 30-cent increase over a two-year contract. The National Catholic Textile Federation took on the giant Dominion Textile Co. in Quebec and won a 13-cent increase in a two-year contract after a bitter 4½ month struggle. In 1960, a country-wide strike against the Dominion Bridge Co. failed to win a master contract for the Steelworkers and gained little over the pre-strike company offer. In the fall of 1960 a strike of non-operating railway workers was averted only by direct government legislation outlawing such action until May 1961. The railway companies had refused to accept the majority recommendation

of the Conciliation Board for a 14-cent wage increase spread over a two-year contract. A Royal Commission is now winding up its study of Canadian transportation and this was the excuse used to rush through the anti-labor legislation against the railway workers.

Among industries with important collective bargaining negotiations in 1961 are auto, rubber, steel, paper, West Coast lumber, electrical and railway running trades, trucking and construction—together covering the majority of trade unions in Canada.

The principle of union liability for damages during a strike is undergoing a court test in the Province of Quebec. As an aftermath of the strike at Gaspé Copper Mines (subsidiary of Noranda, the giant copper trust) the company is suing United Steelworkers for more than \$5 million. The case has been before the courts for several months and promises to be a long, bitter struggle, as was the 1957 strike.

Another variant of this line of attack on trade unions concerns the power of an arbitration board to award damages for breach of a no-strike provision in the contract. Such power was claimed by an arbitration board dealing with a strike at Polymer Corp., a government corporation producing synthetic rubber. The Ontario Supreme Court has confirmed this power.

LEGISLATIVE AND POLITICAL ACTION

The past two years have produced important pieces of anti-labor legislation in several of the provinces. In 1959, the Newfoundland government outlawed the Woodworkers in the middle of a strike and forced them out of the province. The following year, a new Trade Union Act was passed which forces all unions to obtain government registration, which may be denied or revoked. British Columbia enacted legislation which ruled out sympathy strikes and restricted picketing. The next year, the government withdrew check-off rights for 11,000 civil servants. Now there is rumor of contemplated extension of the ban on check-off to all British Columbia unions.

In 1960, the Alberta Labor Act was amended to make it more restrictive on picketing and strikes in public services. In 1960, also, the Ontario Labor Relations Act was tightened up against labor in several important respects. Defeat of the long-entrenched, anti-labor Union Nationale government in the province of Quebec has opened up brighter opportunities for labor there. But so far the promised repeal

of two notorious pieces of legislation has not taken place. There is no doubt that passage of the U.S. Landrum-Griffin Act served as a stimulant to anti-labor legislation in Canada.

In the fall and winter of 1960 the new organizations of unemployed workers succeeded in focusing public attention on problems of the unemployed. Aid and encouragement has been given these organizations by some independent unions. The official Canadian Labor Congress policy, however, frowns on organization of the unemployed, instead insisting on only loose attachment of jobless workers to their old unions. But the actions of unemployed organizations in sending delegations with specific proposals to provincial and federal governments resulted in a 15% increase in relief payments and the undertaking of limited vocational training for unemployed by the government of Ontario, the industrial province with a third of the country's unemployed.

Most significant development on the political front was the continuation of discussions and plans looking for the formation of a New Party. The 1958 CLC convention called for establishing a new political party—"a broadly based peoples' movement, which embraces the CCF, the labor movement, farm organizations, professional people and other liberally minded persons." (See *Labor Fact Book* 14.) Since then attempts have been made by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) and the Canadian Labor Congress leadership to keep out progressives who argue that the New Party should be as broad as the original concept. The apparent attempt by the CCF and CLC leadership to harness the trade unions firmly to financial support of the CCF under a new name is being sharply debated in labor circles. And some of the right-wing, U.S.-dominated craft unions, have been opposing any connection with the new political movement. A founding convention to launch the New Party officially was expected to take place in 1961.

CANADIAN-UNITED STATES AND WORLD RELATIONS

The continued extension of U.S. investments in Canada to the point where half the manufacturing, two-thirds of the base metal mining and three-quarters of the oil and gas resources are U.S.-controlled has begun to worry wide sections of Canadians. It is not an anti-American feeling in any sense antagonistic to the American people. But it opposes the increasing control of the Canadian economy by

U.S. parent companies and subservience of Canadian governments to Washington's commands. Big business, which means largely U.S. monopolies or Canadian interests linked with them, has stepped up the campaign to persuade the Canadian people that U.S. investment is necessary for economic growth in Canada. It has been pointed out, however, that Canada has spent more on military affairs since World War II than the total increase of U.S. and all other foreign capital investments. So it is not a question of insufficient Canadian accumulation, but simply of its use.

Partly as an attempt to distract public fire from themselves, Canadian big business has been asserting that the majority of Canadian trade unions are U.S. controlled. There are signs of a growing national feeling in the Canadian trade union movement. The import of racketeering and goon-squad methods by a few of the international unions has tended to strengthen such feelings.

At the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation convention in the summer of 1960, a resolution favoring Canadian withdrawal from NATO and NORAD passed by a narrow majority. The Canadian Labor Congress position, however, rejects any hint of Canadian neutrality or unilateral disarmament. But it opposes nuclear arms in Canada or in the hands of Canadian forces abroad. Generally on questions of peace, disarmament and trade, the CLC adopts official policies in line with those of the AFL-CIO in the U.S. and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the world organization with which both the U.S. and Canadian federations are affiliated.

INDEX

- Abel, I. W., 89
- Abt, John J., 108
- Accidents, occupational, 33-34, 58, 155; motor vehicle, 58
- Advertising, of alcohol, 75-76; of drugs, 67
- Aging, health of the, 70-72
- Agricultural workers, 47, 53
- Aircraft industry, 26, 32; strikes in, 97
- Air pollution, 61-62
- Alaska, 146
- Alcoholism, 75-76
- Alien Registration Act, 110-111
- Aluminum Workers, 41
- American Cancer Society, 58
- American Civil Liberties Union, 104
- American Committee for Protection of Foreign-born, 115
- American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations, 79-88, 133, 139, 156; on automation, 84; 3rd convention of, 79-85; and co-existence, 85-88; on depressed areas, 83; on foreign policy, 82; on housing, 83; on hours of work, 84; on jobless insurance, 42; and Longshoremen, 80, 81; membership of, 78, 79; and Negroes, 81-82; organizing, 79-80, 84-85; political action, 81; racial discrimination, 81-82; on social security, 36-37; and steel strike, 80; on taxes, 84; on wages, 27; and women workers, 91-92.
- American Federation of Teachers, 121
- American Friends Service Committee, 85
- American Heritage Foundation, 126, 146
- American Home Products Corp., 65
- American Indians, 45
- American Medical Association, 69
- American Smelting & Refining Co., 98
- Americans for Democratic Action, 134
- Antarctic Treaty, 132
- Anti-labor violence, 80
- Anti-Semitism, in hospitals, 69
- Anti-union activities of Un-American committee, 107
- Apprenticeship programs, 49
- Arrests for peace action, 122
- Ashley, Rep. Thomas L., 107
- Atom bombs, 60-61, 87, 88
- Atomic Energy Commission, 96
- Automation, 30-33, 84, 92-93
- Automobile workers, 26, 79, 84, 85, 88, 89; on shorter hours, 30; on unemployment, 31-41; and women, 91
- Bakery Workers, 51
- Balance of payments, 17-18
- Bankruptcies, 10
- Banks, profits of, 13
- Barden, Rep. Graham A., 151
- Barenblatt, Lloyd, 103
- Barry, Carol A., 90
- Bator, Francis M., on federal war expenditures, 15
- Bedingfield, Robert E., on rail automation, 33
- Beirne, Joseph, on automation in communications, 32
- Bernstein, Edward, on U.S. balance of payments, 18
- Bethlehem Steel Co., 96-97
- Bill of Rights, 113
- Black, Hugo L., 103
- Blumberg, Albert, 110
- Boulding, Kenneth, on government spending, 16
- Boulware, L. R., 98
- Boycotts of stores, 120
- Braden, Carl, 105-106
- Brick & Clay Workers, 41
- Bridges, Harry, 92, 100, 139
- British Trades Union Congress, 83
- Buckingham, Prof. Walter, on automation, 31
- Budget, federal, 14-16
- Budgets, family, 26-28, 54-55; for retired couple, 35-36
- Building Trades, 51
- Business failures, 10
- Businessmen in Congress, 138
- Buyers' strikes, 120
- Byrd, Harry F., 135
- California, 40; farm labor in, 47; unequal representation in, 148
- Campaign expenditures, 148
- Canada, 152-160; economic situation, 152-153; strikes in, 157-158; unemployment in, 154-155, 159; unions in, 79, 155-157; U.S. investments in, 159-160; women workers, 154; young workers, 155
- Canadian Labor Congress, 156, 159, 160
- Cancer, program against, 57-58
- Cannery workers, strike of, 92
- Capital expenditures, 8-9
- Carey, James B., 84, 98
- Case, Sen. Clifford P., 150
- Castro, Fidel, 137, 144

- Chain-store sit-ins, 119
- Chamber of Commerce, of U.S., 99
- Chaunt case, 114
- Chicago, 27
- Child labor, 47
- Children, of working mothers, 52
- China, People's Republic of, 86, 142, 145, 153, 157
- Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, 106
- City Worker's Family Budget, 20, 26-27, 64, 154
- Civil liberties, 84, 102-129
- Civil rights, 84, 102-129
- Civil Rights Act, 118, 127, 129, 136
- Civil Rights Commission, 72
- Civil Rights Congress, 105
- Clerical workers, 31-32, 90-91
- Clothing workers, 26, 51, 80, 86, 91
- Co-existence policies, 85-88
- Collective bargaining, 25-26, 92-93; in Canada, 157
- Committee on Political Education (COPE), 139, 140
- Committee on Un-American Activities, 15, 103, 104, 105, 106-108, 117, 137, 139
- Committee power in Congress, 150
- Communications Workers of America, 32, 91
- Communist Control Act, 108
- Communist Party, 100, 108-109, 110, 111, 113, 117, 144
- Confederation of National Trade Unions, 156
- Congress of Racial Equality, 120, 128
- Congress, U.S., 14, 15, 130-134, 137
- Conservative Party, in N. J., 141
- Constitution Party, 141
- Construction workers, 26, 27
- Consumer credit, 10
- Consumer expenditures, in Canada, 153
- Consumer finances, 19
- Consumer price index, 9, 25, 26
- Consumers Union, 66
- Contempt cases, 102-106
- Contributions to election campaign, 149
- "Cooling off period," 100
- Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, 159
- Corporation gifts, in election campaigns, 149
- Corporations, profits of, 12-13
- Corruption in unions and corporations, 80
- Cost of election campaign, 148
- Cost of living, 9, 26-28, 35-36, 64; escalator clauses, 26, 97
- Cousins, Frank, on banning nuclear tests, 82-83
- Coyle, David Cushman, 65
- Cozzini, Georgia, 142
- Cuba, 137, 142, 145, 157
- Curran, Joseph, 86-87
- Davis, H. Chandler, 104
- Dawson, Rep. Wm. L., 138
- Deaths, causes, 57-59
- Death rates, 57, 59, 71, 72
- Debts, of consumers, 10
- De Gregory, Hugo, 105
- Democratic Party, 115, 130, 134, 143
- Denaturalization, 114
- Deportations, 113
- Depreciation, 13-14
- Depressed areas, 38, 41, 42-45, 83
- Desegregation, *see* Integration
- Detroit, income of Negroes in, 22; prices in, 27; unemployment in, 31-32
- Deutch, Bernard, 103, 106
- Diggs, Rep. Charles C., Jr., 138
- Dillon, Douglas, 85
- Disability benefits, 34, 35
- Disarmament, 85, 143, 145, 160
- Discrimination, against Negroes, 49, 56, 81, 88-89
- District of Columbia, voting in, 147
- Dividends, 12-13
- Dixiecrats, 137
- Dobbs, Farrell, 142
- Dodd, Thomas J., 105
- Domestic workers, 53
- Dominion Textile Co., 157
- Dominican dictatorship of Trujillo, 132
- Donner, Frank, 108
- Douglas, Sen. Paul H., 37-38, 39, 43
- Douglas, William O., 103
- Doyle, Rep. Clyde, 147
- Drug monopoly, 65-68
- Du Chessi, William, 44
- Durable goods, hours in, 28
- Eastland, Sen. James O., 129
- Eaton, Cyrus S., 137
- Economic trends, 7-18; in Canada, 152
- Edelman, Mildred McAduy, 145
- Education, 53-55, 84; federal aid to, 132; for Negroes, 122-126; shortages, 53-55
- Eisenhower, Dwight D., 16, 100
- Elections of 1960, 148
- Election laws, 147
- Electrical Workers (IBEW), 41, 91

- Electrical Workers (IUE), 85, 91, 97-98
 Electrical Workers (UE), 30, 37-38, 76, 88, 98, 139, 157
 Ellender, Sen. Allen J., 132
 Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 102, 105
 Emergency program, on unemployment, 42, 44-45
 Emerson, Prof. Thomas I., 126
 Equal pay for women, 53
 Evictions, 128
 Exports, 17-18
- Fair Labor Standards Act, 23, 29, 84
 Fallout effects, 60-61
 Family budgets, 20, 26-28
 Family income, 20
 Farm, income, 11-12; in Canada, 153; parity ratio, 12; population, 11, prices, 12
 Farm labor, 47
 Farm prices, 12
 Farm Research, Inc., 11, 47
 Farmer-labor unity, 98
 Farmers, 11-12
 Faubus, Orval E., 141
 Fayette County, Tenn., persecution of Negro voters in, 128
 Federal budget, 14-16, 133
 Federal Bureau of Investigation, 15, 113, 128
 Fifth Amendment, 117
 Filibusters, in Congress, 131, 150
 First Amendment, 109; cases under, 102-106
 Flemming, Arthur S., 71
 Food additives, 61
 Food prices, 12
 Food relief, 46-47
 Food stamp plan, 131
 Food surpluses, 46-47
 Forand, Aime J., 71
 Foreign-born, rights of, 112
 Foreign trade, 82; of Canada, 153
 Forer, Joseph, 108
 France, Royal W., 115
 Frauds, in elections, 146
 "Freedom Village," Tenn., 128
 Friends Committee on National Legislation, 14, 133
- Garment Workers, 51, 91
 General assistance, 45
 General Electric Co., 31, 81, 97-98
 General Motors Corp., 101
- Georgia, integration in, 125
 Germany, 85
 Gerrymandering, 148
 Gojack, John T., 102
 Gold, 17-18
 Goodrich (B.F.) Rubber Co., 94
 Gorman, Patrick E., on Soviet Union, 87
 Governors of states elected in 1960, 136
 Green, Abner, 115
 Green, Edith, 107
 Gross national product, 7-8, 15; in Canada, 152
- Haas, Eric, 142
 Hall, Oswald, 69
 Harlan County, Ky., strike in, 93-94
 Harlem, 135; housing in, 56
 Hartnett, Al, 85
 Haug, Fred and Marie, 110
 Hawaii, 130, 135, 146
 Haywood County, Tenn., intimidation of Negro voters in, 127
 Hazelton, Pa., unemployment in, 43
 Health insurance, 69, 71-72
 Health problems, 56-76
 Heard, Prof. Alexander, on election costs, 148
 Heart disease, 57, 59
 Heikkila, William, 114
 Heller committee budget, 20, 28, 54-55, 154
 Heller, Walter W., 7
 Hellman, John, 110
 Henderson cotton strike, 95
 Highways, 131
 Hill, Herbert, 88-89
 Hodges, Luther H., 95
 Hoffa, James, 139
 Holland, Elmer J., on unemployment, 33
 Horne, Frank S., on N. Y. City housing, 55-56
 Hospitals, 69-70, 71; charges, 63-64; mental, 73-75; number of beds, 69-70; shortages, 68; strike in, 92, 94; wages in, 23
 Hospital insurance, in Canada, 155
 Hotel workers, 23, 51, 92
 Hours of work, 28-30, 84, 154
 Housing, 10-11, 50, 83; conditions, 55-56, 130, 133; and farm labor, 47
 Robert E. Howe, 140
 HUAC, see Committee on Un-American Activities
 Hunger, in U.S., 46; among West Virginia children, 43

- Illness, 57-59
 Ill-nourished, 46
 Imports, 82
 Income, of consumers, 19; distribution of, 19; of families, 20-21; of farmers, 11-12; of Negroes, 21, 50; taxes on, 22; of women, 21, 52
 Industrial production, 8
 Industrial Union Department (AFL-CIO), 84-85, 91
 Infant mortality, 57, 72
 Influenza, 58
 Integration, in schools, 122
 International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, 160
 Inventories, 8
 Investment of U.S. capital in Canada, 159

 Japan, military bases in, 131
 Johnson, Arnold, 145
 Johnson, Lyndon B., 132, 134
 Jones, Rev. Ashtun, 121

 Kassalow, Everett, on white-collar workers, 91
 Kastenmeier, Rep. Robert W., 107, 138
 Kefauver, Sen. Estes, 65, 66, 67
 Kennecott Copper Corp., 94
 Kennedy, John F., 16, 18, 33, 42, 43-44, 49, 132, 133, 135, 139, 140, 151
 Killingsworth, Prof. Charles, 31
 King, Rev. Martin Luther, 118, 120, 121, 126, 136
 Kissinger, Henry A., 85
 Kneel-in protests, of Negroes, 121
 Knowles, Mary, 102
 Kohler strike, 98
 Ku Klux Klan, 125

 Labor conditions, 19-56
 Labor force, 31; changes in, 38-39
 Labor Research Association Unemployment Index, 37
 Labor's Non-Partisan League, 140
 Landrum-Griffin Act, 81, 98-100, 110, 130, 131
 Latin America, 144
 Laundry workers, 23, 51
 Lawson, Rev. Robert, 121
 Lawyers, in Congress, 138
 Liberal Party, N. Y. State, 141
 Life expectancy, 57, 72

 Lightfoot, Claude, 110
 Literacy tests for voting, 146-147
 Lithographers, 100-101
 Little Rock, Ark., 124
 Liveright, Herman, 102, 103
 Lodge, Henry Cabot, 135
 Long, Sen. Edward V., 149
 Longgood, William, on poisons, 61
 Longshoremen & Warehousemen, 37-38, 86, 92-93, 139
 Longshoremen's Association, 80, 81, 100
 Low-income, families, 55, 83; groups, 59
 Low-wage industries, 23-24
 Lowenstein, Robert, 116
 Loyalty oaths, 117
 Lumer, Hyman, 110

 Machinists, 26, 30, 32, 41, 84, 97
 MacKay, Hamish Scott, 114
 Mackie, William, 114
 Manufacturing, 53; employment in, 90-91; hours of work, 28; wages in, 22, 23, 25
 Marin, Gov. Louis Munoz, 137
 Marine & Shipbuilding Workers, 96-97
 Maritime unions, 51
 Marshall, Thurgood, 120
 Matles case, 114
 Mazey, Emil, 85-86
 McCarran Act. cases under, 108-109
 McCarthy, Eugene J., 43
 McCarthyism, 138, 139
 McClellan committee, 80
 McCormack, Rep. John W., 132
 McDonald, David J., 29
 McNamara, Pat, 63, 70
 McPhaul, Arthur M., 105
 Meany, George, 78, 81-82, 85
 Meat Cutters, 87
 Mechanization and Modernization Agreement, 92-93
 Medical care, 9; for aged, 36, 132; family payments for, 63; rising costs of, 62-63
 Medical manpower shortages, 68-69
 Mental illness, 73-74
 Mexican workers, 45, 47
 Meyer, Rep. William H., 137
 Michigan Survey Research Center, 19, 20, 22
 Migrant workers, 47
 Military expenditures, 14-16, 133
 Military Medical Supply Agency, 66

- Milk lunches, in schools, 131
- Mills, C. Wright, 51
- Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 94, 98, 109
- Mine workers, 140, and accidents, 34; employment, 31, 43-44
- Minimum wage, 23, 132
- Minority parties, 141
- "Moonlighting," 24
- Morris, George, on American labor, 78
- Mulzac, Hugh, 107-108
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 49, 82, 88, 89, 119, 120
- National Association of Manufacturers, 30, 99
- National Cancer Institute, 58
- National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, 121
- National Catholic Textile Federation, 157
- National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE), 60, 88
- National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 107
- National Council of American Soviet Friendship, 88
- National Council of Churches, 108
- National Defense Education Act, 117
- National Education Association, 118
- National Farmers Union, 98
- National Health Service, program for, 76-77
- National income, 64
- National Institute of Mental Health, 73
- National Labor Relations Board, 99-101
- National Maritime Union, 86, 87, 100
- National States Rights Party, 141
- National Urban League, 49, 118
- Negro American Labor Council, 81, 89
- Negroes, 48-49, 88-89, 118, 125, 126; in Congress, 138; health of, 72-73; housing, 55-56; and integration, 122-126; kneelins, 121; in labor force, 48; in schools, 122-123; sit-ins, 119-122; and unemployment, 41, 45, 48, 135; in unions, 81-82; 88-89; voting rights, 127, 128, 135; wages of, 50; women, 48; youth, 49
- Nelson, Gaylord, A., 107
- Net spendable earning of workers, 22
- Neuberger, Maurice, 138
- Neuberger, Richard L., 57-58, 138
- New Orleans, integration in, 123
- New Rochelle, N. Y., sit-down, 121
- New York, living costs, 27, 36; teachers, 116; wages in, 23
- Niebuhr, Reinhold, 112
- Niukkanen case, 113
- Nix, Rep. Robert N. C., 138
- Nixon, Richard M., 133; newspaper support for, 136, 139
- Nixon, Russ, 131
- Noncitizens, rights of, 112
- Nondefense government expenditures, 15
- Nonmanufacturing, hours in, 28-29
- Non-Violent Action Group, 128
- Noto, John Francis, 110
- Nuclear arms, 160
- Nuclear bomb tests, 143; fallout effects, 60-61
- Nuclear weapons transfer, 133
- Nurses, shortages, 68-69
- O'Connor, Harvey, 105
- Office workers, 31-32, 90-91
- O'Hara, Rep. Barratt, 107
- Ohio case, 110
- Old-wage and survivors insurance, 35
- Older workers, 34-37; discrimination against, 155; health of, 70-72
- "Operation Abolition," 108
- Overproduction, of metals, 152
- Oxnam, G. Bromley, 128
- Packinghouse Workers, 24, 30, 95
- Padilla, Dr. Elena, 51
- Parke, Davis & Co., 66
- Part-time employment, 29, 39
- Pauling, Linus C., 60-61, 104-105
- Payton, Boyd, 95
- Peace, policy for, 15; political platform on, 145
- Pennsylvania, 41
- People's health, 55-76
- People's Republic of China, *see* China
- Peoples' Rights Party, 145
- Physicians, Negro, 73; shortages of, 68
- Picketing, 101
- Plumbers & Pipe Fitters, 41
- Pneumonia, 58
- Poisons, in food, 59-60; in air, 60-62
- Political action, of labor, 81
- Political parties, control of, 145
- Poll taxes, 127, 146

- Porter, Rep. Charles O., 137
- Postal workers, 24
- Poverty, 19, 23, 45-47
- Powell, Rep. Adam C., 138, 151
- Press, in the 1960 election, 136
- Price, William A., 102, 103
- Prices, 9, 17; of farm products, 12
- Production, industrial, 8; workers in, 31
- Professional workers, 90-91
- Profits, of corporations, 12-14
- Progressive congressmen, 131
- Prohibition Party, 141
- Public assistance, 45
- Public Health Services, 70, 72
- Public works, 131
- Puerto Ricans, in U.S., 45, 50-51; housing, 50, 72; in New York, 50, 56; in unions, 51, 81
- Puerto Rico, 137
- Railroad brotherhoods, 81, 88, 140
- Railroad Retirement Act, 72
- Railroad workers, 26, 30, 31, 49, 88; strikes of, 97
- Randolph, A. Philip, 81-82; 89, 139
- Rayburn, Rep. Sam., 151
- Real wages, 22
- Recession, 7-10; effects of, 10-11, 17-18, 38-39, 41
- Reed, Sam, 110
- Reinthal, Eric J., 110
- Relief rolls, 35, 45-46
- Remes, Andrew, 110
- Rents, 9; of Puerto Ricans, 50
- Representation in Congress and legislatures, 147
- Republican Party, 130, 135, 136
- Research and promotion, of drugs, 66-67
- Residency laws, 146
- Retail Clerks, 79, 92
- Retail trade, 9, 79; Puerto Ricans in, 51; wages in, 23
- Retired couple, budget for, 35-36
- Retirement benefits, 34-36
- Reuther, Walter, 30, 84, 89
- Rich's department store, Atlanta, Ga., 120
- "Right to work" laws, 101
- Romney, George, on wealthy men in public office, 149
- Roosevelt, James, 106
- Rosenberg, Julius and Ethel, 111
- Rosenblum, Frank, 86
- Rubber Workers, 26, 41
- Rules Committee of House, 130, 150, 151
- Rule 22, of the Senate, 150
- Runaway plants, 44
- Rusk, Howard, 75
- Russell, Norton A., 102
- Russo, Michael, 110
- Ryan, William F., 107
- Safety legislation, 155
- San Francisco, prices in, 27, 28; automation in, 32; demonstration in, 107
- SANE, *see* National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy
- Savings of individuals, 20, 63
- Scales, Junius Irving, 111
- Schering Corp., 65
- Schneiderman, William, 111
- Schools, federal aid to, 54; and integration, 122; shortages, 53-55
- Seamen, 107-108
- Segregated colleges, government aid to, 126
- Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, 102, 103, 104, 139
- Senate Subcommittee on Problems of Aged and Aging, 63, 70
- Senior, Clarence, 51
- Sharecroppers, Negro, 127
- Sheet Metal Workers, 101
- Shelton, Robert, 102, 103
- Shipyards, strikes in, 96-97
- Shoe Workers, 82
- Sit-in demonstrations, 119
- Sleeping Car Porters, 81, 88, 139
- Smith Act, membership cases, 110
- Smith, Rep. Howard W., 134, 150
- Smith, Sen. Margaret C., 138
- Sobell, Morton, 111
- Social conditions, 19-56
- Social security, 34-37, 84
- Social Security Act, 34-36
- Socialist International, 143
- Socialist Labor Party, 142
- Socialist Party—Social Democratic Federation, 143
- Socialist Workers Party, 142
- Socialized medicine, 76
- South, integration, in, 118, 119-120, 122-126; violence in, 120; voting rights in, 126-129
- Southern Christian Leadership Conference, 120
- Southern Conference Educational Fund, 106, 107, 128
- Southern Regional Council, 125
- Southern control of Congress, 151
- Soviet Union, 86, 87, 132, 142
- "Spending units," income of, 19-20

- Spiegel, Jack, 87
- State Commission Against Discrimination (N.Y.), 49
- State governors, 136
- Statutes of limitations, 115
- Steel strike, 9, 80, 93, 95-96
- Steelworkers, 26, 29, 31, 41, 79, 84, 157, 158
- Stock ownership, 20
- Stork Club, 101
- Strikebreakers, 96
- Strikes, in 1959-60, 93-98; in aircraft, 97, of auto workers, 97; in Canada, 157-158; General Electric, 97-98; Henderson, N. C., 95; hospitals, 92, 94; Kohler Co., 98; of miners, 93-94; Mine-Mill, 94; packinghouse, 95; railroads, 96, 97; rubber workers, 94; shipyards, 94-95; steel workers, 95-96
- Strontium 90, effects of, 59-60
- Structure of working class, 90
- Students, Negro, 119
- Substandard wages, 23
- Subversive Activities Control Act, 108-109
- Suicides, 71
- Supervisory parole, 114
- Supplementary unemployment benefits, (SUB), 41-42
- Surplus food, 46-47
- Taft-Hartley Act, 80, 98, 100-101, 110
- Taxes, 16-17, 84; federal, 16-17; on incomes, 27-28, 84; state and local, 27
- Teachers, 53; cases, 115; "moonlighting," 24; shortages of, 54
- Teachers Union, 117
- Teamsters, 78, 80, 92, 98, 101, 139, 156
- Telephone workers, 26, 32
- Tennessee, strike in, 93-94
- Textile workers, 26, 44, 80, 95; wages of, 23
- Trade unions, 78-101; and automation, 84; in Canada, 79, 155; directory of, 78; on foreign policy, 82; membership, 78, 79; and Negroes, 81-82; political action, 81; and wages, 27
- Transport & General Workers Union, 82-83
- Travis, Maurice E., 109
- Trujillo, General, 132
- Tuberculosis, 73
- Tucker, R. W., on socialized medicine, 76
- Turoff, Sidney, 105
- Un-American Committee, *see* Committee on Un-American Activities
- Unemployment, 7, 28, 31-32; extent of, 37-39, 42-45; in Canada, 152
- Unemployment insurance, 39-42, 84
- Union leaders, visits to Soviet Union, 86-88
- United Nations, 145; delegates' housing, 56
- University of Georgia, integration in, 125
- Uphaus, Willard, 103-104, 105
- U.S. capital in Canada, 159
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 55-56, 125, 126
- Urey, Prof. Harold C., 112
- Utilities, 26
- Vanderbilt University, 121
- Violence, against Negroes, 120; against integrationists, 121
- Volunteer Civil Rights Commission, 127
- Voters, number of, 146
- Voting age, 146
- Voting restrictions, 118, 146; against Negroes, 127
- Wages, 22-26, 27, 51; in Canada, 153; differentials, 22-24; increases, 25-26; minimum, 23; Negroes, 21, 50; net spendable, 22; in strikes, 93; substandard, 23; union contracts, 25-26; of women, 52-53
- Wakefield, Dan, 50
- Walter, Rep. Francis E., 108
- Walter-McCarran Immigration Act, 112, 115
- War expenditures, 14-16
- Waste and duplication, in health agencies, 64-65; in medical care, 64, 76-77
- Watkins (John T.) decision, 103
- Watson, Goldie, 102, 117
- Weiss, Max, 110
- West, James F., 110
- West Virginia, 42, 43, 44; strike in, 93-94
- Westinghouse Electric Corp., 30
- White Citizens Councils, 122, 124
- White-collar workers, 32, 89-91
- Whitehouse, Albert, 84-85
- Whitman, Alden, 103
- Wilkinson, Frank, 106
- Williams, Aubrey, 107
- Wilson, & Co., 95
- Winston, Henry, 111

- Wirin, A. L., 105
Women, 51-53, 91-92; in Canada labor force, 154; in Congress, 138; equal pay, 53; income of Negroes, 21; in unions, 91-92; wages of, 52-53
Women's Auxiliaries, 92
Woodworkers, in Newfoundland, 156, 158; in British Columbia, 157
Work injuries, 33-34
Working rules, 93
World Health Organization, 77
Young workers, 32, 145, 155

BOOKS OF CURRENT INTEREST

PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

J. M. Budish

The myth of mass stock ownership. Monopoly under a new name.
Economic development. 50c

THE U.S.A. AND THE U.S.S.R.

Victor Perlo

The Economic Race

A comparison of rates of economic growth of capitalist and socialist society. Cloth \$2.50; Paper \$1.25

DECISION IN AFRICA

Alphaeus Hunton

A basic study and dramatic account of the social structures and the fight for independence on the whole African continent.

Cloth \$4.00; Paper \$1.85

CUBA: HOPE OF A HEMISPHERE

Joseph North

The people and the revolution. Work, education, political and social life. Fidel Castro, Che Guevara, other leaders.

Cloth \$2.00; Paper \$.95

THE BRITISH LABOR MOVEMENT

A. L. Morton and George Tate

A political history, from the 90's of the last century with stress upon the emergence of the Labor Party and its role. \$3.00

WOMEN WHO WORK

Grace Hutchins

Living Conditions, Jobs and Wages, Discrimination, Negro Women, Trade Unions, Women in the Fight for Peace. 75c

THE HISTORICAL ADVANCE OF WORLD SOCIALISM

William Z. Foster

The crisis of capitalism and the development of world socialism to the present. The growing world predominance of socialism. 50c

LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION PAMPHLET SERIES

Billionaire Corporations, 35c; Apologists for Monopoly, 50c; The Burden of Taxes, 35c; U.S. Over Latin America by Herman Olden, 50c; The Income "Revolution" by Victor Perlo, 35c; U.S. and the Philippines, 50c.

A series of basic booklets now in preparation will deal with the Housing Problem in the U.S., the Crisis in Education, and People's Health and Medical Care.

Write for Complete Catalog

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

381 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.